

# SOME REMARKS ON WHITHAM DYNAMICS

Robert Carroll  
University of Illinois  
email: rcarroll@math.uiuc.edu

April, 1998

## Abstract

A number of formulas are displayed concerning Whitham theory for a simple example of pure  $N = 2$  susy Yang-Mills (YM) with gauge group  $SU(2)$ . In particular this serves to illuminate the role of  $\Lambda$  and  $T_1$  derivatives and the interaction with prepotentials  $F^{SW}$  (Seiberg-Witten) and  $F^W$  (Whitham).

## 1 INTRODUCTION

One knows that there are remarkable relations between integrable hierarchies,  $N = 2$  susy YM, and Whitham theory (see e.g. [6, 10, 11, 12, 13, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 46, 52]). There is also a stringy background involving Calabi-Yau (CY) manifolds, mirror symmetry, and branes (see e.g. [28, 32, 37]) but we go back to more elementary matters involving SW curves in order to clarify the role of Whitham dynamics (cf. also [2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 19, 20, 21, 22, 33, 41, 42, 49, 50] for related papers). A basic reference is [27] which shows how  $\Lambda$  and  $T_1$  derivatives are related in the Toda framework (cf. also [12, 13, 24]) and we adapt this to the example in [26] to obtain similar relations plus a number of new formulas and some richer perspective. Another interesting matter involves relations between WDVV theories for  $F^{SW}$  and  $F^W$ ; this was discussed briefly in [12, 13] and, using [29], will be developed further in [16] (cf. also [4, 7, 8, 23, 34, 35, 36, 40, 43, 44, 45]).

## 2 THE $SU(2)$ EXAMPLE - TODA FORM

One goes back to [49] for this (cf. also [5, 24, 26, 27, 30, 32, 37, 42, 46, 50] for example - many other sources are omitted here to keep the bibliography finite). Thus without going into the physics here we follow [13, 27, 46] at first and look at the curve ( $g = N - 1 = 1$ )

$$P(\lambda) = \Lambda^2 \left( w + \frac{1}{w} \right); \quad y = \Lambda^2 \left( w - \frac{1}{w} \right); \quad y^2 = P^2 - 4\Lambda^4 \quad (2.1)$$

with  $(\bullet)$   $w = (1/2\Lambda^2)(P + y)$  and  $w^{-1} = (1/2\Lambda^2)(P - y)$ ; also  $(u = u_2)$

$$P(\lambda) = \lambda^2 - u = (\lambda - \lambda_1)(\lambda - \lambda_2); \quad u = \lambda_1 \lambda_2; \quad (2.2)$$

$$\log\left(1 - \frac{u}{\lambda^2}\right) = -\sum_2^\infty \frac{h_k}{\lambda^k} \Rightarrow h_2 = h = u$$

Further on a given curve ( $u$  and  $\Lambda$  fixed)

$$dS_{SW} = \lambda \frac{dw}{w} = \frac{\lambda dy}{P} = \frac{\lambda dP}{y} = \frac{\lambda P' d\lambda}{y} = \frac{2\lambda^2 d\lambda}{y}; \quad (2.3)$$

$$a = \oint_A dS_{SW} = \oint_A \frac{\lambda P' d\lambda}{\sqrt{P^2 - 4\Lambda^4}} = \oint_A \frac{2\lambda^2 d\lambda}{\sqrt{\lambda^4 - 2u\lambda^2 + u^2 - 4\Lambda^4}}$$

while from  $\delta P + P'\delta\lambda = 0$  with  $\delta P = -\delta u$  one has ( $\delta w = 0 = \delta\Lambda$ )

$$\left. \frac{\partial dS_{SW}}{\partial u} \right|_{w=c} = \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial u} \frac{dw}{w} = \frac{dw}{P'w} = \frac{d\lambda}{y} = d\hat{v} \quad (2.4)$$

leading to ( $\spadesuit$ )  $\partial a / \partial u = \oint_A d\hat{v} = \sigma$  and we take  $dw = (1/\sigma)d\hat{v}$  as the canonical holomorphic differential. More generally from ( $\bullet$ ) one has

$$\delta P + P'\delta\lambda = NP\delta\log(\Lambda) + y\frac{\delta w}{w} \quad (2.5)$$

**REMARK 2.1.** Let us show how two relevant standard representations of an elliptic curve are related (cf. [32, 33]). Thus consider ( $\clubsuit$ )  $y^2 = (x^2 - u)^2 - \Lambda^4$  with  $u > \Lambda$  which can be written in the form  $y^2 = \prod_1^2 (x - e_i^\pm)$  where  $e_1^+ = -\sqrt{u + \Lambda^2}$ ,  $e_1^- = -\sqrt{u - \Lambda^2}$ , and  $e_2^+ = \sqrt{u + \Lambda^2}$  with  $e_2^- = \sqrt{u - \Lambda^2}$  (note that a factor of 4 in  $4\Lambda^2$  is omitted here from (2.1) - it will be inserted below when needed). One can then produce a transformation  $x \rightarrow [(ax + b)/(cx + d)]$  taking  $e_1^+ \rightarrow \infty$ ,  $e_1^- \rightarrow -\Lambda^2$ , and  $e_2^- \rightarrow \Lambda^2$  yielding an equivalent curve with branch points  $\pm\Lambda^2$ ,  $\tilde{u}(u, \Lambda)$ , and  $\infty$ . Such a curve can also be described via  $y^2 = 4(x - \Lambda^2)(x + \Lambda^2)(x - \tilde{u})$  which corresponds to a curve  $y^2 = 4x^3 - g_2(u)x - g_3(u)$  related to the Weierstrass  $\mathcal{P}$  function

$$\mathcal{P}(z, \tau) = \frac{1}{z^2} + \sum_{w \in L/\{0\}} \left( \frac{1}{(z - w)^2} - \frac{1}{w^2} \right) \quad (2.6)$$

with  $x = \mathcal{P}$  and  $y = \mathcal{P}'$ . Here  $L$  is a lattice with basic parameters  $w_1 = \pi$  and  $w_2 = \pi\tau$  where  $w_2/w_1 = \tau$ . It will be convenient now to express a version of the above calculation as follows. Write  $Q(x) = (x - a)(x - b)(x - c)(x - d)$  and set  $x = a + (1/z)$  to get

$$Q(x) = \frac{(a - b)(a - c)(a - d)}{z^4} \tilde{Q}(z); \quad \tilde{Q}(z) = \left( z + \frac{1}{a - b} \right) \left( z + \frac{1}{a - c} \right) \left( z + \frac{1}{a - d} \right) \quad (2.7)$$

It follows that  $(dx/\sqrt{Q(x)}) = -(dz/\sqrt{\tilde{Q}(z)})$  up to a constant multiplier. If now we want  $e_1^+ = a \rightarrow \infty$  then write  $b = e_1^-$ ,  $c = e_2^+$ , and  $d = e_2^-$  so in particular  $a - c = -2\sqrt{u + \Lambda^2}$ . Thus  $a - b = \sqrt{u - \Lambda^2} - \sqrt{u + \Lambda^2}$  with  $a - d = -\sqrt{u + \Lambda^2} - \sqrt{u - \Lambda^2}$ . We now map  $1/(a - b) \rightarrow \Lambda^2$  and  $1/(a - d) \rightarrow -\Lambda^2$  via

$$z \rightarrow \zeta = -\frac{2\Lambda^4 z}{(u - \Lambda^2)^{1/2}} - \Lambda^2 \left( \frac{u + \Lambda^2}{u - \Lambda^2} \right)^{1/2} \quad (2.8)$$

This leads to

$$y^2 = Q(x) = \frac{(a-b)(a-c)(a-d)}{z^4}(\zeta + \Lambda^2)(\zeta + \Lambda^2)(\zeta - \tilde{u}) \quad (2.9)$$

for some  $\tilde{u} = \tilde{u}(u, \Lambda)$  and then scaling via  $z^4 y^2 = \eta^2(a-b)(a-c)(a-d)$  we obtain (••)  $\eta^2 = (\zeta + \Lambda^2)(\zeta - \Lambda^2)(\zeta - \tilde{u})$ . Thus we can work with (♣)  $y^2 = (x^2 - u)^2 - \Lambda^4$  (Toda form) or with (••)  $\eta^2 = (\zeta + \Lambda^2)(\zeta - \Lambda^2)(\zeta - \tilde{u})$  (KdV form). Mathematically they would appear to be equivalent formulations but physically one is interchanging electric and magnetic sectors (cf. [33, 49]). For the curves (♣) one has cycles  $A$  surrounding  $e_1^+$  and  $e_1^-$  and  $B$  surrounding  $e_1^-$  and  $e_2^-$  with e.g.  $\oint_A \sim 2 \int_{e_1^+}^{e_1^-}$ . Thus it is probably easier to work with (••) for the pure  $SU(2)$  theory although for general  $N_f$  and  $N_c$  one has a canonical Toda formulation involving curves such as (♣).

Let us now give a description of the curve (♣) in different parametrizations following [13, 27] but we now insert  $\Lambda^2$  in the formulas; the calculations are worth seeing for comparison with the modified treatment below for the curve in KdV form. We write  $z \sim \xi^{-1}$  as a local coordinate near  $\infty_{\pm}$  where  $\infty_{\pm}$  refers to  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  (which is not a branch point) and recall again (♣)  $y^2 = (\lambda^2 - u)^2 - \Lambda^4 = \prod_1^2(\lambda - e_i^{\pm})$ , so  $\infty_{\pm} \sim (y, \lambda) = (\pm, \infty)$ . From (•)  $w = (1/2\Lambda^2)(P + y)$  and  $w^{-1} = (1/2\Lambda^2)(P - y)$  one sees that  $w^{\pm 1} = (1/2\Lambda^2)(P \pm y) \sim (1/\Lambda^2)P(\lambda)(1 + O(\lambda^{-4}))$  near  $\infty_{\pm}$ . To see this note  $P(\lambda) = O(\lambda^2)$  and  $w^{\pm 1} = (1/2\Lambda^2)P(\lambda)(1 \pm (y/P))$ . Then from  $y^2 = P^2 - 4\Lambda^4$  one has  $(y^2/P^2) = 1 - (4\Lambda^4/P^2) = 1 - O(\lambda^{-4})$  which implies that  $y/P = 1 + O(\lambda^{-4})$ . Consequently one has  $w^{\pm 1} \sim (1/\Lambda^2)P(\lambda)$  near  $\infty_{\pm}$  and we note  $w(\lambda = \infty_+) = \infty$  with  $w(\lambda = \infty_-) = 0$ . The curve is clearly hyperelliptic in the  $(y, \lambda)$  parametrization but not in the  $(w, \lambda)$  parametrization  $(w + w^{-1})\Lambda^2 = P(\lambda) = \lambda^2 - u$  where  $\Lambda\xi \equiv w^{-1/2} \sim \Lambda\lambda^{-1}$  near  $\infty_+$  and  $\Lambda\xi \equiv w^{1/2} \sim \Lambda\lambda^{-1}$  at  $\infty_-$  (i.e.  $\Lambda\xi \sim w^{\mp 1/2}$  at  $\infty_{\pm}$ ). Now one defines differentials  $d\Omega_n \sim \pm w^{\pm n/2}(dw/w) = (2/n)dw^{\pm n/2}$  near  $\infty_{\pm}$  corresponding to  $d\Omega_n \sim (2/n)d(\Lambda\xi)^{-n}$  near  $\infty_{\pm}$  so  $d\Omega_n \sim -2\Lambda^{-n}\xi^{-n-1}d\xi$  with normalization  $\oint_A d\Omega_n = 0$ . In taking residues at  $\xi = 0$  one has two points  $\infty_{\pm}$  to consider where  $\Lambda\xi \sim w^{\mp 1/2}$  so  $\xi^{-1} \sim P^{1/2}$  in the  $w$  parametrization and  $d\Omega_n$  has two poles. One can also look at the hyperelliptic parametrization  $(y, \lambda)$  with two sheets and talk about  $d\Omega_n^{\pm}$  based on  $\xi \sim \lambda^{-1}$  with a single pole at  $(\pm, \infty)$ . We also consider the differentials (cf. [16, 52] for clarification)

$$d\hat{\Omega}_n = P_+^{n/2}(\lambda) \frac{dw}{w} \quad (2.10)$$

having poles at  $\xi \sim w^{\mp 1/2}$  corresponding to  $\infty_{\pm}$  which are to balance those of  $d\Omega_n$  in a formula ( $d\Omega_n = d\hat{\Omega}_n - (\oint_A d\hat{\Omega}_n)d\omega$ )

$$dS = \sum T_n d\hat{\Omega}_n = \alpha d\omega + \sum T_n d\Omega_n; \quad \frac{\partial dS}{\partial \alpha} = d\omega; \quad \frac{\partial dS}{\partial T_n} = d\Omega_n \quad (2.11)$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $T_n$  can be taken to be independent (cf. [10, 30]). We note that these  $d\Omega_n$  do not coincide with those of [10, 46] (nor do the  $T_n$ ) but essentially we only deal with  $T_1$  and  $d\Omega_1 \sim d\Omega_1^+ + d\Omega_1^-$  here and these will be the same. In fact we work entirely in the KdV

framework starting in Section 3 and primarily with a standard  $T_1$  and  $d\Omega_1$  as in [10, 46]; a  $T_3$  and  $d\Omega_3$  are indicated in passing and these are made explicit. Now from  $P_+^{1/2}(\lambda) = \lambda$  we see that  $d\hat{\Omega}_1 = dS_{SW}$  and near  $\infty_{\pm}$  one has  $d\hat{\Omega}_1 \sim \mp(2d\xi/\xi)$  via  $\lambda \sim \xi^{-1}$  and  $d\xi = \mp(1/2)w^{\mp(1/2)-1}dw$ . Thus in particular this is compatible with  $d\Omega_1 \sim \pm w^{\pm 1/2}(dw/w) \sim \pm(\Lambda\xi)^{-1}(dw/w)$ , or more generally  $d\Omega_n \sim \pm(2/n)d(\Lambda\xi)^{-n} \sim \mp 2\Lambda^{-n}(d\xi/\xi^{n+1})$ . Now from (2.11) we obtain the Whitham dynamics of  $u$  from

$$\frac{\partial dS}{\partial T_n} = d\hat{\Omega}_n + \sum T_m \frac{\partial d\hat{\Omega}_m}{\partial u} \frac{\partial u}{\partial T_n} = d\Omega_n \Rightarrow \quad (2.12)$$

$$\Rightarrow - \oint_A d\hat{\Omega}_n = \sum T_m \frac{\partial u}{\partial T_n} \oint_A \frac{\partial d\hat{\Omega}_m}{\partial u}$$

since  $\oint_A d\Omega_n = 0$ . But a basic assumption is that  $\partial dS/\partial u = dV$  where  $dV$  is a holomorphic differential (which can be achieved via a stipulation  $\partial d\hat{\Omega}_n/\partial u = \beta_n d\omega$ ), and of necessity  $d\hat{\Omega}_n = d\Omega_n + c_n d\omega$  (where  $\oint_A d\hat{\Omega}_n = c_n$ ). Thus  $\oint_A (\partial d\hat{\Omega}_m/\partial u) = \oint_A \beta_m d\omega = \beta_m$  and (2.12) implies ( $\clubsuit$ )  $\partial u/\partial T_n = -c_n(\sum T_m \beta_m)^{-1}$ .

Now the procedure of [27] (reproduced in [13]) gives an abstract formula ( $u \sim u_2 \sim h$ )

$$\left. \frac{\partial u}{\partial \log(\Lambda)} \right|_{a=c} = 2u - a \frac{\partial u}{\partial a} \quad (2.13)$$

(cf. below) as well as an expression for  $\partial u/\partial \log(\Lambda)$  in terms of theta functions (which we omit here). To see how this goes we recall first (cf. [13, 27]) an abstract derivation of connections between  $\log(\Lambda)$  and  $\log(T_1)$  derivatives. Thus first note from (2.11) that

$$\oint_{A_i} dS = \sum T_n \oint_{A_i} d\hat{\Omega}_n = \alpha_i \Rightarrow \alpha_i = T_1 a_i + O(T_2, T_3, \dots) \quad (2.14)$$

Hence for our example  $\alpha = T_1 a + O(T_2, T_3, \dots)$ . Next write from (2.1)

$$\delta P + P' \delta \lambda = 2P \delta \log(\Lambda) + y \frac{\delta w}{w} \quad (2.15)$$

so for  $\delta w = 0$  one has ( $\spadesuit$ )  $P' \delta \lambda - \delta u = 2\lambda \delta \lambda - \delta u = 2P \delta \log(\Lambda)$ . Also note from  $P = \lambda^2 - u$  one has ( $\bullet\bullet\bullet$ )  $\lambda dP = \lambda[2\lambda d\lambda] = 2(P + u)d\lambda$ . Hence from ( $\spadesuit$ ) for  $\delta w = 0$

$$\delta a = \oint_A \delta \lambda \frac{dw}{w} = \delta u \oint_A \frac{dw}{2\lambda w} + \delta \log(\Lambda) \oint_A \frac{2P}{P'} \frac{dw}{w} \quad (2.16)$$

Recall now  $dv = (1/P')(dw/w) = (d\lambda/y)$  and  $\partial a/\partial u = \oint_A dv = \sigma$  so for  $\delta a = 0$  one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \left. \frac{\partial u}{\partial \log(\Lambda)} \right|_{a=c} \right) \oint_A dv &= - \oint_A \frac{2P}{P'} \frac{dw}{w} = - \oint_A \frac{2P d\lambda}{y} = \\ &= - \oint_A \frac{\lambda dP - 2ud\lambda}{y} = -a + 2u \oint_A dv \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

Thus, multiplying by  $\partial u/\partial a = 1/\sigma$  we get (2.13). Next from (2.14) one has

$$\begin{aligned} \delta\alpha &= a\delta T_1 + T_1\delta a + O(T_2, T_3, \dots) \Rightarrow \\ \Rightarrow \delta\alpha &= \alpha\delta\log(T_1) + T_1 \oint_A \delta\lambda \frac{dw}{w} + O(T_2, T_3, \dots) \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

Hence for constant  $\Lambda$  and  $T_n = 0$  for  $n \geq 2$  (with  $\alpha$  and  $T_n$  independent)  $\delta\alpha = 0$  implies

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\alpha}{T_1} &= - \oint_A \frac{\partial\lambda}{\partial\log(T_1)} \frac{dw}{w} = - \oint_A \frac{\partial\lambda}{\partial u} \frac{\partial u}{\partial\log(T_1)} \frac{dw}{w} = \\ &= - \frac{\partial u}{\partial\log(T_1)} \oint_A dv = -\sigma \left. \frac{\partial u}{\partial\log(T_1)} \right|_{\alpha=c} \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

(cf. (2.4) and ( $\spadesuit$ )  $\partial a/\partial u = \sigma$ ). Thus we have  $-\sigma(\partial u/\partial\log(T_1)) = a$  from (2.19) and  $\sigma(\partial u/\partial\log(\Lambda)) = -a + 2u(\partial a/\partial u)$  from (2.17), which implies

$$\left. \frac{\partial u}{\partial\log(T_1)} \right|_{\alpha=c} = -\frac{a}{\sigma} = -a \frac{\partial u}{\partial a} = \left. \frac{\partial u}{\partial\log(\Lambda)} \right|_{a=c} - \frac{2u}{\sigma} \frac{\partial a}{\partial u} = \left. \frac{\partial u}{\partial\log(\Lambda)} \right|_{a=c} - 2u \quad (2.20)$$

**REMARK 2.2.** Note that  $\partial d\hat{\Omega}_1/\partial u = \beta_1 d\omega = dv$  as in (2.4) and  $d\hat{\Omega}_1 = d\Omega_1 + c_1 d\omega$  (cf. remarks after (2.12)) imply ( $\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit$ )  $\sigma = \oint_A dv = \beta_1$  and  $c_1 = \oint_A d\hat{\Omega}_1 = a$ . Hence the Whitham dynamics in ( $\clubsuit\clubsuit\clubsuit$ ) for  $u$  become for  $T_n = 0$  ( $n \geq 2$ )

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial T_1} = -c_1(T_1\beta_1)^{-1} = -\frac{a}{T_1\sigma} = -\frac{a}{T_1} \frac{\partial u}{\partial a} \quad (2.21)$$

(recall  $\sigma = \partial a/\partial u$ ) and this is precisely the homogeneity condition for moduli:  $T_1\partial_1 u + a\partial_a u = 0$  (cf. [10, 30]).

**REMARK 2.3.** The equations

$$\frac{\partial F^W}{\partial T_1} = \frac{2T_1 h_2}{i\pi}; \quad \Lambda \partial_\Lambda F^{SW} = \frac{2T_1^2 u}{i\pi} \quad (2.22)$$

for  $T_n = 0$  ( $n \geq 2$ ), from [13, 27] (with  $\Lambda \sim T_1$  in the SW theory) should correspond here to an equation  $\partial F^{SW}/\partial\log(\Lambda) = \partial F^W/\partial\log(T_1)$ . This involves a heavy abuse of notation since  $F^W \rightarrow F^{SW}$  when  $T_n \rightarrow \delta_{n,1}$  and thus  $\Lambda$  seems to acquire a fixed value 1 if  $\Lambda \sim T_1$ . Note in [12, 13, 24] for example that  $T_1$  acquires a fixed value  $1/i\pi$  for pure  $SU(2)$  SW theory in a slightly different normalization ( $N_f = 0$ ,  $N_c = 2$ ,  $m_i = 0$ ). The comment in [27] in this regard is that the SW theory itself allows for  $T_1$  derivatives since after rescaling  $h_k \rightarrow T_1^k h_k$  and  $\mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow T_1^k \mathcal{H}_k$  one can identify  $T_1$  with  $\Lambda$ , and  $\Lambda$  is explicitly present in the SW theory (which is rather confusing). We will clarify all this below for the curve in KdV form and similar considerations apply for the Toda form.

### 3 EXPLICIT FORMULAS FOR THE KdV CURVE

We consider the curve now in the form (cf. Remark 2.1)  $y^2 = (\lambda - \Lambda^2)(\lambda + \Lambda^2)(\lambda - v)$  as in [2, 7, 8, 26, 42, 49]. First we want an explicit connection between formulas based on the curve in two equivalent forms **(A)**  $y^2 = (\lambda - \Lambda^2)(\lambda + \Lambda^2)(\lambda - v)$  and **(B)**  $\eta^2 = (\mu - 1)(\mu + 1)(\mu - \tilde{v})$ . Thus in **(A)** set  $\lambda = \Lambda^2\mu$  to get  $y^2 = \Lambda^6(\mu - 1)(\mu + 1)(\mu - \tilde{v})$  for  $\tilde{v} = v/\Lambda^2$ . Then set  $y^2 = \Lambda^6\eta^2$  for the form **(B)**. Compare then e.g. the formulas

$$a(v, \Lambda) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \int_{-\Lambda^2}^{\Lambda^2} \frac{d\lambda \sqrt{\lambda - v}}{\sqrt{\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4}}; \quad \tilde{a}(\tilde{v}) = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\pi} \int_{-1}^1 \frac{d\mu \sqrt{\mu - \tilde{v}}}{\sqrt{\mu^2 - 1}} \quad (3.1)$$

from [7] and [42] respectively where e.g.  $dS_{SW} = (1/\pi\sqrt{2})[(\lambda - v)d\lambda/y]$  with  $\partial dS_{SW}/\partial v = -(1/2\pi\sqrt{2})(d\lambda/y)$ . Setting  $\lambda = \Lambda^2\mu$  again one obtains  $a(\Lambda, v) \sim \Lambda \tilde{a}(\tilde{v} = (v/\Lambda^2))$  (which corresponds to  $\Lambda b(\tilde{v})$  in [7]), and similarly  $a^D(v, \Lambda) \sim \Lambda \tilde{a}^D(\tilde{v} = (v/\Lambda^2))$  where  $a^D(v, \Lambda) = (\sqrt{2}/\pi) \int_{\Lambda^2}^v [\sqrt{\lambda - v}/\sqrt{\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4}] d\lambda$ . We recall also the Picard-Fuchs type equations

$$\left[ (1 - \tilde{v}^2) \partial_{\tilde{v}}^2 - \frac{1}{4} \right] \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{a} \\ \tilde{a}^D \end{pmatrix} = 0 \equiv \left[ \partial_v^2 + \frac{1}{4(v^2 - \Lambda^4)} \right] \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a^D \end{pmatrix} = 0 \quad (3.2)$$

In [7] one concludes that  $aF_a^{SW} + \Lambda F_\Lambda^{SW} = 2F^{SW}$  since  $\tau = F_{aa}^{SW}$  is dimensionless and thence from  $2F^{SW} - aF_a^{SW} = -8\pi iv/4\pi^2 = -(2iv/\pi)$  that  $\Lambda F_\Lambda^{SW} = -(2iv/\pi)$  (cf. below for more detail). Further, beta functions are defined in [7] via

$$\beta(\tau) = \Lambda \partial_\Lambda \tau|_{v=c}; \quad \beta^a(\tau) = \Lambda \partial_\Lambda \tau|_{a=c} \quad (3.3)$$

Some calculation gives then for  $G(\tau) = v/\Lambda^2$  the formula  $\Lambda \partial_\Lambda G = -2v/\Lambda^2$  so  $\Lambda \partial_\Lambda G = \Lambda \partial_\tau G \partial_\Lambda \tau = \beta(\tau) \partial_\tau G = -2v/\Lambda^2 = -2G$  which implies  $\beta(\tau) = -2G/G_\tau$  and  $G(0) = 1$  can be shown. This leads to

$$v = \Lambda^2 \exp \left( -2 \int_0^\tau \beta^{-1}(x) dx \right) \equiv v(\tau) = \left( \frac{\Lambda}{\Lambda_0} \right)^2 v(\tau_0) e^{-2 \int_{\tau_0}^\tau \beta^{-1}(x) dx} \quad (3.4)$$

Then from  $2F^{SW} - aF_a^{SW} = -(2iv/\pi) = \Lambda F_\Lambda^{SW}$  one has

$$\partial_\Lambda F^{SW} = -\frac{2iv\Lambda}{\pi} e^{-2 \int_0^\tau \beta^{-1} dx} \equiv \partial_\Lambda F^{SW}(a, \Lambda) = \frac{\Lambda}{\Lambda_0} \partial_{\Lambda_0} F^{SW}(a_0, \Lambda_0) e^{-2 \int_{\tau_0}^\tau \beta^{-1} dx} \quad (3.5)$$

Another expression for  $\beta$  arises from (cf. [7] and recall  $a(\Lambda, v) \sim \Lambda b(\tilde{v})$  with  $\tilde{v} = v/\Lambda^2$ )

$$d\tau = (\partial_\Lambda \tau)_a d\Lambda + (\partial_a \tau)_\Lambda da = (\partial_\Lambda \tau)_v d\Lambda + (\partial_v \tau)_\Lambda dv; \quad (3.6)$$

$$da = (\partial_\Lambda a)_v d\Lambda + (\partial_v a)_\Lambda dv = b d\Lambda + \Lambda b' d\tilde{v} = (b - 2\tilde{v}b') d\Lambda + \Lambda^{-1} b' dv$$

This leads to

$$(\partial_\Lambda \tau)_v = (\partial_\Lambda \tau)_a + (b - 2\tilde{v}b')(\partial_a \tau)_\Lambda \quad (3.7)$$

But moduli are homogeneous functions of degree zero, i.e.

$$a(\partial_a \tau)_\Lambda + \Lambda(\partial_\Lambda \tau)_a = 0 \quad (3.8)$$

This can be seen in various ways (cf. [7, 30]) and is shown explicitly below. Now using (3.8) in (3.7) one obtains (recall  $a = \Lambda b$ )

$$\beta(\tau) = \Lambda(\partial_\Lambda \tau)_v = -a(\partial_a \tau)_\Lambda + (b - 2\tilde{v}b')(\partial_a \tau)_\Lambda = -2\Lambda\tilde{v}b'(\partial_a \tau)_\Lambda = \frac{2\tilde{v}b'}{b}\beta^a(\tau) \quad (3.9)$$

since  $\beta^a = \Lambda(\partial_\Lambda \tau)_a = -a(\partial_a \tau)_\Lambda = -\Lambda b(\partial_a \tau)_\Lambda$  from (3.3). Note also  $\Lambda(\partial_\Lambda \tau)_a = -a(\partial_a \tau)_\Lambda = -\Lambda b(\partial_b \tau/\Lambda)_\Lambda = -b(\partial_b \tau)_\Lambda$ .

Let us go now to [26] and rewrite some of the formulas with  $\Lambda^2$  inserted. First from [5] the notation will involve  $u \rightarrow \tilde{v}$  and  $x \sim z \rightarrow \mu$  with

$$a = \Lambda\tilde{a} = \Lambda\sqrt{2}(\tilde{v} + 1)^{1/2}F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2}{\tilde{v} + 1}\right) = \sqrt{2}(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right);$$

$$a^D = \Lambda\tilde{a}^D = \frac{i}{2\Lambda}(v - \Lambda^2)^{1/2}F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 2, \frac{\Lambda^2 - v}{2\Lambda^2}\right) \quad (3.10)$$

Now as in [26], first in the  $(z, u)$  notation, one can look at the elliptic curve as a finite zone KdV curve (e.g. think of an elliptic 1-gap solution to KdV based on the Weierstrass  $\mathcal{P}$  function) so that there can be a background KdV theory associated to the curve (cf. [3, 10, 15, 25, 47] for more detail). Here one recalls that for KdV there are differentials  $d\Omega_{2j+1}(z) = (P_{j+g}(z)/y(z))dz$ ;  $y^2 \sim (z^2 - 1)(z - u)$ . In particular one writes

$$dp \equiv d\Omega_1 = \frac{z - \alpha(u)}{y(z)}dz; \quad dE \equiv d\Omega_3(z) = \frac{z^2 - \frac{1}{2}uz - \beta(u)}{y(z)}dz \quad (3.11)$$

The normalization conditions  $\oint_A d\Omega_i = 0$  yield  $\alpha(u)$  and  $\beta(u)$  immediately. Associated with this situation we have the classical Whitham theory (cf. [6, 10, 11, 23, 25, 34, 35, 36, 46]) giving  $(t_n \rightarrow T_n = \epsilon t_n, \epsilon \rightarrow 0)$   $(\partial d\Omega_i(z)/\partial T_j) = (\partial d\Omega_j(z)/\partial T_i)$ ;  $d\Omega_i(z) = (\partial dS(z)/\partial T_i)$  where  $dS$  is some action term which classically was thought of in the form  $dS = \sum T_i d\Omega_i$ . In fact it will continue to have such a form in any context for generalized times  $T_A$  (including the  $a_i$ ) and generalized differentials  $d\Omega_A$  (cf. [12, 35]). It is shown in [26] that

$$dS(z) = \left(T_1 + T_3\left(z + \frac{1}{2}u\right) + \dots\right) \times \frac{z - u}{y(z)}dz = g(z|T_i, u)\lambda_{SW}(z) \quad (3.12)$$

where  $\lambda_{SW}$  is the SW differential  $(z - u)dz/y(z)$  (actually  $\lambda_{SW} = \pi\sqrt{2}dS_{SW}$  - cf. (3.1)). The demonstration is sort of ad hoc and goes as follows. Setting  $T_{2k+1} = 0$  for  $k > 1$  and computing from (3.12) one gets

$$\frac{\partial dS(z)}{\partial T_1} = \left(z - u - \left(\frac{1}{2}T_1 + \frac{3}{4}uT_3\right)\frac{\partial u}{\partial T_1}\right) \frac{dz}{y(z)}; \quad (3.13)$$

$$\frac{\partial dS(z)}{\partial T_3} = \left( z^2 - \frac{1}{2}uz - \frac{1}{2}u^2 - \left( \frac{1}{2}T_1 + \frac{3}{4}uT_3 \right) \frac{\partial u}{\partial T_3} \right) \frac{dz}{y(z)}$$

so requiring  $\partial_1 dS = d\Omega_1$  and  $\partial_3 dS = d\Omega_3$  gives via (3.11)

$$\left( \frac{1}{2}T_1 + \frac{3}{4}uT_3 \right) \frac{\partial u}{\partial T_1} = \alpha(u) - u; \quad \left( \frac{1}{2}T_1 + \frac{3}{4}uT_3 \right) \frac{\partial u}{\partial T_3} = \beta(u) - \frac{1}{2}u^2 \quad (3.14)$$

Hence the construction gives a solution to the general Whitham equation of the form **(WW)**  $\partial u / \partial T_3 = v_{31}(u)(\partial u / \partial T_1)$  with  $v_{31} = [\beta(u) - (1/2)u^2] / [\alpha(u) - u] = [d\Omega_3(z) / d\Omega_1(z)]$  (evaluated at  $z = u$ ), which is what it should be from the general Whitham theory (cf. [10, 25]). It follows that (modulo a constant)

$$a = \frac{1}{T_1} \oint_A dS(z) \Big|_{T_3=T_5=\dots=0}; \quad a_D = \frac{1}{T_1} \oint_B dS(z) \Big|_{T_3=T_5=\dots=0} \quad (3.15)$$

Note here  $(1/T_1)dS|_{T_3=0} = [(z-u)/y(z)]dz = \lambda_{SW}$  is fine but one does not seem to have the form  $dS = ad\omega + \sum T_n d\Omega_n$  as in [30] (cf. also [10, 11]) where  $cd\omega = dz/y(z) = d\hat{v}$  is a holomorphic differential with  $\oint_A d\omega = 1$  and  $\oint_B d\omega = \tau$ . To put this in a more canonical form one obtains  $\alpha$  via

$$\oint_A d\Omega_1 = 0 = \oint_A \frac{z-\alpha}{y} dz = \oint_A \frac{zdz}{y} - \alpha c \Rightarrow \alpha = \frac{1}{c} \oint_A \frac{zdz}{y} \quad (3.16)$$

Similarly  $(1/c) \oint_A [(z^2 - (1/2)uz)/y] dz = \beta$  and for  $T_3 = 0$

$$dS = T_1 \lambda = T_1 \left[ \frac{z-\alpha}{y} + \frac{\alpha-u}{y} \right] dz = T_1 d\Omega_1 + T_1 (\alpha(u) - u) cd\omega \quad (3.17)$$

Thus  $T_1(\alpha(u) - u)c \sim T_1 \hat{a}$  ( $\sim \alpha$  in (2.11)) where  $4\hat{a} = \oint_A \lambda$  here, and we refer to (3.22) for a slightly “refined” version.

Let us now put in the constant  $\pi\sqrt{2}$  and  $\Lambda$  so  $dS_{SW} = (1/\pi\sqrt{2})\lambda_{SW}$  with  $a = \oint_A dS_{SW} = (1/\pi\sqrt{2}) \oint_A \lambda_{SW}$  as in (3.1) and we set  $u = v/\Lambda^2$  with  $z = \lambda/\Lambda^2$ . Then  $\Lambda^6 y^2 = (\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)(\lambda - v) = \eta^2$  (here  $\eta \leftrightarrow y$  in **(B)**) with  $dz = \Lambda^{-2} d\lambda$  and

$$d\Omega_1 = \frac{(\lambda - \tilde{\alpha})d\lambda}{\Lambda\eta} = \frac{1}{\Lambda} d\tilde{\Omega}_1; \quad d\Omega_3 = \frac{(\lambda^2 - (1/2)v\lambda - \tilde{\beta})d\lambda}{\Lambda^3\eta} = \frac{1}{\Lambda^3} d\tilde{\Omega}_3 \quad (3.18)$$

where  $\tilde{\alpha} = \Lambda^2 \alpha(v/\Lambda^2)$  and  $\tilde{\beta} = \Lambda^4 \beta(v/\Lambda^2)$ . Further **(SW)**  $dS_{SW} = (1/\pi\sqrt{2})(\lambda - v)d\lambda/\eta) = (\Lambda/\pi\sqrt{2})\lambda_{SW}$  since  $\lambda_{SW} = [(z-u)/y]dz = (\lambda-v)d\lambda/\Lambda\eta$ . Now we can drop the  $\Lambda$  and  $\Lambda^3$  factors in  $d\Omega_1$  and  $d\Omega_3$  (they do not affect normalization and only contribute a multiplier to the asymptotics) and simply take  $dS_{SW}$  as in **(SW)** with  $\oint_A dS_{SW} = a$  to coincide with (3.1). Then use  $\oint_A d\tilde{\Omega}_i = 0$  to get

$$0 = \oint_A \frac{\lambda - \tilde{\alpha}}{\eta} d\lambda = \oint_A \frac{\lambda d\lambda}{\eta} - \tilde{\alpha} \oint_A d\tilde{v} \Rightarrow \tilde{\alpha} = \frac{1}{\tilde{c}} \oint_A \frac{\lambda d\lambda}{\eta} \quad (3.19)$$

(i.e.  $d\tilde{v} = \tilde{c}d\tilde{\omega}$  where  $d\tilde{\omega}$  is the canonical holomorphic differential - note  $d\hat{v} = (dz/y) = (d\lambda/\Lambda\eta) = (1/\Lambda)d\tilde{v}$ ). Similarly **(E)**  $(1/\tilde{c})\oint_A[(\lambda^2 - (1/2)\lambda v)/\eta]d\lambda = \tilde{\beta}$ . Now one can write

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 dS_{SW} &= \frac{T_1}{\pi\sqrt{2}} \left[ \frac{\lambda - \tilde{\alpha}}{\eta} + \frac{\tilde{\alpha} - v}{\eta} \right] d\lambda = \\ &= \frac{T_1}{\pi\sqrt{2}} [\tilde{c}(\tilde{\alpha} - v)d\tilde{\omega} + d\tilde{\Omega}_1] \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

with **(EE)**  $a = (1/\pi\sqrt{2})\tilde{c}(\tilde{\alpha} - v)$ . Similarly  $T_3[z + (1/2)u]dS_{SW}$  becomes

$$T_3 \left( \frac{\lambda + (1/2)v}{\Lambda^2} \right) \left( \frac{(\lambda - v)d\lambda}{\pi\sqrt{2}\eta} \right) = \frac{T_3}{\Lambda^2\pi\sqrt{2}} \left[ d\tilde{\Omega}_3 + \left( \tilde{\beta} - \frac{1}{2}v^2 \right) \frac{d\lambda}{\eta} \right] \quad (3.21)$$

leading to

**PROPOSITION 3.1.** The differential  $dS$  of (3.12) has a “canonical” form

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{S} &= [T_1 + T_3(z + (1/2)u)]dS_{SW} = T_1 \left[ ad\tilde{\omega} + \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2}}d\tilde{\Omega}_1 \right] + \\ &+ \frac{T_3}{\Lambda^2\pi\sqrt{2}} \left[ d\tilde{\Omega}_3 - \left( \tilde{\beta} - \frac{1}{2}v^2\tilde{c}d\tilde{\omega} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.22)$$

Apparently the only reason for the  $T_3$  term in [26] was to exhibit the Whitham equation **(WW)** but this has basically nothing to do with SW theory as such. In order to study relations between  $T_1$  and  $\Lambda$  derivatives we set now  $T_3 = 0$  and look at Whitham theory based on  $T_1$  and  $a$ , so

$$d\tilde{S} = T_1 ad\tilde{\omega} + \frac{T_1}{\pi\sqrt{2}}d\tilde{\Omega}_1 = \gamma d\tilde{\omega} + T_1 d\tilde{\Omega}_1 \quad (3.23)$$

where  $\gamma = aT_1$  is used instead of  $\alpha$  as in (2.11) since  $\alpha, \tilde{\alpha}$  appear here already with other meanings. Here  $\Lambda$  and  $v$  will satisfy  $(\oint_A d\tilde{\omega} = 1)$

$$\tilde{c}(v, \Lambda)d\tilde{\omega} = d\tilde{v} = \frac{d\lambda}{\eta}; \quad a = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2}}\tilde{c}(\tilde{\alpha} - v); \quad (3.24)$$

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \frac{1}{\tilde{c}} \oint_A \frac{\lambda d\lambda}{\eta} = \tilde{\alpha}(v, \Lambda); \quad d\tilde{\Omega}_1 = \frac{\lambda - \tilde{\alpha}}{\eta} d\lambda; \quad d\tilde{\Omega}_1 = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2}}d\tilde{\Omega}_1$$

The object now is to understand the relations between  $T_1$  and  $\Lambda$  derivatives related to  $F^{SW}$  and  $F^W$ .

**REMARK 3.2.** Note an argument analogous to (2.5), (2.15), (2.18), (2.20) can be envisioned based on  $\eta^2 = (\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)(\lambda - v)$  via

$$2\eta\delta\eta = [2\lambda(\lambda - v) + (\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)]\delta\lambda - 3\Lambda^3\delta\Lambda(\lambda - v) - (\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)\delta v = \quad (3.25)$$

$$= (\lambda^2 - 2v\lambda - \Lambda^4)\delta\lambda - 3\Lambda^3(\lambda - v)\delta\Lambda - (\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)\delta v$$

but arguments using this in a manner similar to Section 2 seem too contrived so we prefer to work from explicit formulas below.

We note next that (cf. (2.4))

$$a = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2}} \oint_A \frac{\sqrt{\lambda - v}}{\sqrt{\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4}} d\lambda; \quad \left. \frac{\partial a}{\partial v} \right|_\Lambda = -\frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{2}} \oint_A \frac{d\lambda}{\eta} = -\frac{\tilde{c}(v, \Lambda)}{2\pi\sqrt{2}} = \tilde{\sigma} \quad (3.26)$$

Similarly (considering the  $A$  cycle as fixed and encircling the cut)

$$\left. \frac{\partial a}{\partial \Lambda} \right|_v = \frac{3\Lambda^3}{2\pi\sqrt{2}} \oint_A \frac{\lambda - v}{\eta(\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)} d\lambda \quad (3.27)$$

This integral cannot as such be written as  $2 \int_{-\Lambda^2}^{\Lambda^2}$  and moreover we probably should better consider  $2 \int_{-\Lambda^2}^{\Lambda^2}$  for  $a$  directly and include variation of end points with  $\Lambda$ . (in fact (3.27) seems incompatible with explicit formulas as in (4.26) so we will forget it). Here (3.26) is analogous to ( $\spadesuit$ )  $\partial a / \partial u = \sigma$ .

We note now from [18] that for  $d\hat{v} = dx/y = dx/\sqrt{x(x-1)(x-v)}$  one can write  $\pi_1 = 2 \int_0^1 d\hat{v}$  with  $\pi_2 = 2 \int_1^v d\hat{v}$  (there are too many  $v$ ,  $\hat{v}$ , and  $\tilde{v}$  symbols but no confusion should arise). Then compute as in [18]

$$\partial_v \left( \frac{1}{y} \right) = \frac{1}{2y(x-v)}; \quad \partial_v^2 \left( \frac{1}{y} \right) = \frac{3}{4y(x-v)^2} \quad (3.28)$$

$$d \left( \frac{y}{(x-v)^2} \right) = -\frac{1}{2} d\tilde{v} - (4v-2)\partial_v d\tilde{v} - 2v(v-1)\partial_v^2 d\tilde{v} \Rightarrow \quad (3.29)$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{4}\pi_i + (2v-1)\partial_v \pi_i + v(v-1)\partial_v^2 \pi_i = 0$$

These are the Picard-Fuchs (PF) equations (cf. also (3.2)). Applied to our situation we can modify the calculations in [18] and consider  $\eta = \sqrt{(\lambda - \Lambda^2)(\lambda + \Lambda^2)(\lambda - v)}$  with  $d\tilde{v} = d\lambda/\eta$ . Then

$$\partial_v d\tilde{v} = \partial_v \left( \frac{d\lambda}{\eta} \right) = \frac{d\lambda}{2\eta(\lambda - v)}; \quad \partial_v^2 d\tilde{v} = \frac{3d\lambda}{4\eta(\lambda - v)^2} \quad (3.30)$$

Now we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi = d \left( \frac{\eta}{(\lambda - v)^2} \right) &= \frac{d\lambda}{2(\lambda - v)^{3/2}} \left( (\lambda - \Lambda^2)^{1/2}(\lambda + \Lambda^2)^{-1/2} + (\lambda + \Lambda^{1/2}(\lambda - \Lambda^2)^{-1/2} \right) + \\ &+ \frac{d\lambda}{2(\lambda - v)^{3/2}} \sqrt{\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4} - \frac{2\eta d\lambda}{(\lambda - v)^3} \end{aligned} \quad (3.31)$$

and this becomes

$$\Xi = d\lambda \left[ \frac{(\lambda + \Lambda^2) + (\lambda - \Lambda^2)}{2\eta(\lambda - v)} - \frac{3(\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)}{2\eta(\lambda - v)^2} \right] = \quad (3.32)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (\lambda + \Lambda^2)\partial_v d\tilde{v} + (\lambda - \Lambda^2)\partial_v d\tilde{v} - 2(\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)\partial_v^2 d\tilde{v} = (\lambda - v + v + \Lambda^2)\partial_v d\tilde{v} + \\
&\quad + (\lambda - v + v - \Lambda^2)\partial_v d\tilde{v} - 2(\lambda - v + v + \Lambda^2)(\lambda - v + v - \Lambda^2)\partial_v^2 d\tilde{v} = \\
&= \frac{d\tilde{v}}{2} + (v + \Lambda^2)\partial_v d\tilde{v} + \frac{d\tilde{v}}{2} + (v - \Lambda^2)\partial_v d\tilde{v} - 2(\lambda - v + v + \Lambda^2) \left( \frac{3}{2}\partial_v d\tilde{v} + (v - \Lambda^2)\partial_v^2 d\tilde{v} \right) = \\
&= d\tilde{v} + 2v\partial_v d\tilde{v} - \frac{3}{2}d\tilde{v} - 3(v + \Lambda^2)\partial_v d\tilde{v} - 3(v - \Lambda^2)\partial_v d\tilde{v} - 2(v^2 - \Lambda^4)\partial_v^2 d\tilde{v} = \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}d\tilde{v} - 4v\partial_v d\tilde{v} - 2(v^2 - \Lambda^4)\partial_v^2 d\tilde{v}
\end{aligned}$$

**PROPOSITION 3.3.** Integrating in (3.32) gives the PF equations ( $d\tilde{v} = d\lambda/\eta$ )

$$0 = \frac{1}{4}\pi_i + 2v\partial_v \pi_i + (v^2 - \Lambda^4)\partial_v^2 \pi_i \quad (3.33)$$

where  $\pi_1 = 2 \int_{-\Lambda^2}^{\Lambda^2} d\tilde{v} \sim \oint_A d\tilde{v} = \tilde{c} = -2\pi\sqrt{2}\tilde{\sigma}$  and  $\pi_2 = 2 \int_{\Lambda^2}^v d\tilde{v} \sim \oint_B d\tilde{v}$ .

**REMARK 3.4.** In particular we have

$$\frac{1}{4}\tilde{c} + 2v\partial_v \tilde{c} + (v^2 - \Lambda^4)\partial_v^2 \tilde{c} = 0 \equiv 2v\partial_v \tilde{\sigma} + (v^2 - \Lambda^4)\partial_v^2 \tilde{\sigma} + \frac{1}{4}\tilde{\sigma} = 0 \quad (3.34)$$

for comparison to a differentiated form of the Picard-Fuchs equations from [27], namely **(PF)**  $4(4\Lambda^4 - h^2)(\partial\sigma/\partial h) = a$  (cf. also (3.2)). In fact this is exact (modulo some parameter adjustment) since  $\partial a/\partial v = \tilde{\sigma}$  while in **(PF)**  $\partial a/\partial h = \sigma$ . Consequently one can use heuristically

$$4(\Lambda^4 - v^2)\partial_v \tilde{\sigma} = a \quad (3.35)$$

as an integrated form of (3.34) (cf. [7, 42] to confirm exactness).

**REMARK 3.5.** Let us remark that from Whitham theory with  $d\tilde{S}$  as in (3.22) one will have  $(\Lambda, v)$  as functions of  $(\gamma, T_1)$  with  $\gamma, T_1$  regarded as independent (cf. [10, 30]). However since  $a = a(v, \Lambda)$  one can think of  $a$  as a function of  $(\gamma, T_1)$  or think of  $v = v(a, \Lambda)$ , or introduce  $\tau = \tau(v, \Lambda)$  as a modulus with perhaps  $\tau = \tau(a, \Lambda)$ , etc. (cf. [7, 42] and (3.1) - (3.9)). Thus we will try to specify the fixed variables in partial derivatives when any confusion can arise, e.g.  $(\partial_\Lambda \tau)_v \equiv \partial_\Lambda \tau|_v$  etc.

## 4 PREPOTENTIALS

Let us try to construct the prepotentials  $F^{SW}$  and  $F^W$  now for the curve of Section 3. For the Whitham theory we can use the formulation in [10] for one puncture (based on [46]) and ignore the more extensive developments in [11, 12, 13] based on [19, 20, 23, 34, 35, 36]. We will only deal with the differential  $d\check{\Omega}_1$  as in (3.23)) plus the canonical  $d\tilde{\omega}$  (the curve will be taken in the form  $\eta^2 = (\lambda - \Lambda^2)(\lambda + \Lambda^2)(\lambda - v)$  with  $d\tilde{v} = d\lambda/\eta$ ). There will be standard formulas for  $F_\gamma$  with  $d\tilde{S} = T_1 dS_{SW} = T_1 ad\tilde{\omega} + T_1 d\check{\Omega}_1 = \gamma d\tilde{\omega} + T_1 d\check{\Omega}_1$  as in

(3.23) ( $d\check{\Omega}_1 = (1/\pi\sqrt{2})d\tilde{\Omega}_1$ ) and  $\gamma, T_1$  are independent variables with  $\partial d\tilde{S}/\partial\gamma = d\tilde{\omega}$  and  $\partial d\tilde{S}/\partial T_1 = d\check{\Omega}_1$  while

$$\gamma^D = F_\gamma^W = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_B d\tilde{S}; \quad F_{\gamma\gamma}^W = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_B d\tilde{\omega} = \frac{\tau}{2\pi i} \quad (4.1)$$

(factors of  $2\pi i$  etc. come and go - these are consistent with [10, 46], but  $F_a^{SW} = \oint_B dS_{SW}$  in [7] so (3.8) - (3.9) may need adjustment when put into the present framework - see remarks after (4.13) below). Further

$$F_1^W = \partial_1 F^W = -Res_\infty z^{-1} d\tilde{S}; \quad 2F^W = \gamma F_\gamma^W + T_1 F_1^W = \frac{\tau}{2\pi i} \gamma^2 + 2T_1 \gamma F_{1\gamma}^W + T_1^2 F_{11}^W \quad (4.2)$$

and we recall from [10, 46] that near  $\lambda = \infty$  with  $z \sim \lambda^{-1/2}$  one can write

$$d\tilde{\omega} = - \sum_1^\infty \sigma_{1,m} z^{m-1} da; \quad d\check{\Omega}_1 = \left( -cz^{-2} - \sum_1^\infty q_{1,m} z^{m-1} \right) dz \quad (4.3)$$

(a multiplier  $c = \sqrt{2}/\pi$  is needed here via (4.51) below). Next we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 F^W &= -Res_\infty z^{-1} d\tilde{S} = \\ &= Res_\infty z^{-1} [\gamma \sum_1^\infty \sigma_{1,m} z^{m-1} + T_1 (z^{-2} + \sum_1^\infty q_{1,m} z^{m-1})] dz = \gamma \sigma_{1,1} + T_1 q_{1,1} \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

and  $\gamma \partial_\gamma F^W = (\gamma/2\pi i) \oint_B d\tilde{S} = \gamma^2 \tau / 2\pi i + (\gamma T_1 / 2\pi i) \oint_B d\check{\Omega}_1$  while the Riemann bilinear relations give  $(1/2\pi i) \oint_B d\check{\Omega}_1 = \sigma_{1,1}$  (cf. [10, 46, 51]). Consequently

$$2F^W = \gamma F_\gamma^W + T_1 F_1^W = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \gamma^2 \tau + 2\gamma T_1 \sigma_{1,1} + T_1^2 q_{1,1} \quad (4.5)$$

Note also  $(1/2\pi i) F_{\gamma 1} = (1/2\pi i) \oint_B \partial_1 d\tilde{S} = (1/2\pi i) \oint_B d\check{\Omega}_1 = \sigma_{1,1}$  so (4.5) and (4.1) are compatible. From the above we can also write

$$2F^W = \gamma^2 \frac{\partial^2 F^W}{\partial \gamma^2} + 2\gamma T_1 \frac{\partial^2 F^W}{\partial \gamma \partial T_1} + T_1^2 \frac{\partial^2 F^W}{\partial T_1^2} \quad (4.6)$$

and we emphasize (as in [27]) that  $F^W$  is not just a quadratic function of  $\gamma$  and  $T_1$ . A nontrivial dependence on these variables is expressed via the Whitham equations (here e.g. **(L)**  $\partial_1 d\tilde{\omega} = \partial_\gamma d\check{\Omega}_1$ ) which involves the dependence of  $d\tilde{\omega}$  and  $d\check{\Omega}_1$  on  $(\gamma, T_1)$  (recall also (2.21) where the Whitham dynamics (**♣♣**) of  $u$  correspond to the homogeneity condition for moduli). In the present situation one could write for  $\Lambda$  constant (modeled on (2.12) and (3.23))

$$\begin{aligned} d\tilde{S} = T_1 dS_{SW} &= \gamma d\tilde{\omega} + T_1 d\check{\Omega}_1 \Rightarrow \partial_1 d\tilde{S} = dS_{SW} + T_1 \frac{\partial dS_{SW}}{\partial v} \frac{\partial v}{\partial T_1} = \\ &= d\check{\Omega}_1 \Rightarrow \oint_A dS_{SW} + T_1 \frac{\partial v}{\partial T_1} \oint_A \frac{\partial dS_{SW}}{\partial v} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

But  $\oint_A(\partial dS_{SW}/\partial v) = \partial a/\partial v = \tilde{\sigma}$  from (3.26) and consequently one obtains from the Whitham dynamics of  $v$

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial \log(T_1)} = T_1 \frac{\partial v}{\partial T_1} = -\frac{a}{\tilde{\sigma}} \quad (4.8)$$

To use **(L)** let us write (cf. [10, 17]))

$$\partial_\gamma \left[ z^{-2} + \sum_1^\infty q_{1m} z^{m-1} \right] = \partial_1 \sum_1^\infty \sigma_{1m} z^{m-1} \Rightarrow \partial_\gamma q_{1m} = \partial_1 \sigma_{1m} \quad (4.9)$$

and various arguments yield  $q_{1m} = F_{1m}^W = \partial^2 F^W / \partial T_1 \partial T_m$ . This can be based on asymptotics at  $\infty$  using the Baker-Akhiezer (BA) function and  $dKP$  formulas as in [10] (cf. also [46]). If  $\partial_n S = \mathcal{B}_n = \lambda_+^n$  with  $\partial_1 S = P$  corresponds to dKP (cf. [14]) then at  $\infty$ ,  $\partial_n dS \sim d\mathcal{B}_n \sim \partial_n d\tilde{S} \sim d\tilde{\Omega}_n$ . Thus in particular the coefficients in (4.6) depend on  $\gamma$  and  $T_1$  and in any event we can write  $F^W$  as in (4.5), expressed entirely in terms of Riemann surface (RS) quantities. It is interesting that the natural modulus  $\tau$  appears here since this comes up in discussing the beta function and many formulas are known (cf. [2, 7] and Section 3). Note that formulas (3.1) - (3.9) for example (with  $T_1 = 1$ ) go into the present notation via  $(y, v) \rightarrow (\eta, v)$ .

Now we have  $F^W$  given entirely in terms of RS quantities via (4.5) and this deserves attention. Note also, if we regard the curve as arising from a background 1-zone KdV situation one can also treat  $-2F_{11}$  as the dispersionless potential  $U(T_1)$  arising from  $u(x)$  in the Lax operator  $\partial^2 - u(x)$  ( $x \rightarrow X = T_1$ ); we refer to [14, 15] for discussion of this). We remark further that the Whitham equations  $\partial_\gamma d\tilde{\Omega}_1 = \partial_1 d\tilde{\omega}$  should lead to equations for branch point dependence on  $(\gamma, T_1)$  as in [10, 25]. This means that  $(\Lambda, v)$  are functions of  $(\gamma, T_1)$  and the dependence of  $\Lambda$  on  $T_1$  has been neglected so far. In this direction we recall  $d\tilde{\Omega}_1 = (1/\pi\sqrt{2})(\lambda - \tilde{\alpha})(d\lambda/\eta)$  where (cf. **(EE)**)  $a = (1/\pi\sqrt{2})\tilde{c}(\tilde{\alpha} - v)$  and  $\tilde{c}d\tilde{\omega} = d\lambda/\eta$ . The Whitham equations  $\partial_1 d\tilde{\omega} = \partial_\gamma d\tilde{\Omega}_1$  then entail for  $\Lambda = \text{constant}$

$$\partial_1 \frac{1}{\tilde{c}\eta} = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2}} \partial_\gamma \frac{\sqrt{\lambda - v}}{\sqrt{\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4}} - \partial_\gamma \frac{(a/\tilde{c})}{\eta} \quad (4.10)$$

After performing the derivations (with  $\Lambda$  constant) one multiplies by  $(\lambda - v)^{3/2}$  and lets  $\lambda \rightarrow v$ ; this yields (using  $\partial_a = T_1 \partial_\gamma$  for  $T_1$  constant)

$$\partial_1 v|_{\gamma, \Lambda} = -a \partial_\gamma v|_{1, \Lambda} \equiv T_1 \partial_1 v|_{\gamma, \Lambda} + a \partial_a v|_{1, \Lambda} = 0 \quad (4.11)$$

which is again the standard homogeneity condition for the modulus  $v$ . On the other hand holding  $v$  constant and repeating this procedure one obtains, after multiplying by  $(\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)^{3/2}$  and letting  $\lambda \rightarrow \Lambda^2$ , we have  $\partial_1 \Lambda = (\tilde{c}/\pi\sqrt{2})(\Lambda^2 - v)\partial_\gamma \Lambda - a \partial_\gamma \Lambda$  leading to

$$T_1 \partial_1 \Lambda + a \partial_a \Lambda = -2(\Lambda^2 - v) \frac{\partial a}{\partial v} \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial a} \quad (4.12)$$

Similarly, letting  $\lambda \rightarrow -\Lambda^2$  one gets  $T_1 \partial_1 \Lambda + a \partial_a \Lambda = 2(\Lambda^2 + v)\partial_v a \partial_a \Lambda$  so we conclude that  $\partial_v a \partial_a \Lambda \sim \partial_v \Lambda = 0$  (as could be expected for  $(v, \Lambda)$  independent) and (4.12) is again a

homogeneity condition. Thus, heuristically one arrives at

**PROPOSITION 4.1.** Under the hypotheses indicated, we obtain from the Whitham equations  $\partial_1 d\tilde{\omega} = \partial_\gamma d\tilde{\Omega}_1$ , the equations  $T_1 \partial_1 v|_{\gamma, \Lambda} + a \partial_a v|_{1, \Lambda} = 0$  for  $\Lambda$  constant, and  $T_1 \partial_1 \Lambda|_{\gamma, v} + a \partial_a \Lambda|_{1, v} = 0$  for  $v$  constant. These homogeneity equations can also be obtained from the Whitham dynamics of  $v$  as in (4.7) or  $\Lambda$  as in (4.16) below.

It would be nice now to work in  $\tau$  in order to utilize the formulas and techniques of [2, 4, 7, 8, 9, 42], some of which is indicated in (3.1) - (3.9). In this direction we note first from (3.26) and (4.7) that  $(d\lambda/\eta = \tilde{c}d\tilde{\omega})$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_B d\tilde{\Omega}_1 &= \sigma_{11} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_B dS_{SW} - \frac{T_1 \partial_1 v}{2\pi i 2\pi\sqrt{2}} \oint_B \tilde{c} d\tilde{\omega} \Rightarrow \\ \Rightarrow \sigma_{11} &= a^D + T_1 \tilde{\sigma} \partial_1 v \tau = a^D + T_1 (\partial_1 a) \tau \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Note again that in Section 3,  $F_a^{SW} = \oint_B dS_{SW}$  but in Section 4,  $F_\gamma^W = (1/2\pi i) \oint_B d\tilde{S}$  and we will distinguish whenever necessary. Now consider (in the notation of Section 4)

$$\partial_v a^D = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_B \frac{\partial dS_{SW}}{\partial v} = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{2}} \oint_B \frac{d\lambda}{\eta} = \frac{\tau \tilde{\sigma}}{2\pi i} \quad (4.14)$$

Next we have in a straightforward manner

$$\partial_v \sigma_{11} = \frac{\tau \tilde{\sigma}}{2\pi i} + T_1 (\partial_v \partial_1 a) \tau + T_1 (\partial_1 a) \partial_v \tau = \left( \frac{\tilde{\sigma}}{2\pi i} + T_1 \partial_1 \tilde{\sigma} \right) \tau + T_1 (\partial_1 a) \tau_v \quad (4.15)$$

Now for  $v$  constant and variable  $\Lambda$  (4.7) corresponds to

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 d\tilde{S} &= dS_{SW} + T_1 \frac{\partial dS_{SW}}{\partial \Lambda} \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial T_1} = d\tilde{\Omega}_1 \Rightarrow 0 = \\ &= \oint_A dS_{SW} + T_1 \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial T_1} \oint_A \frac{\partial dS_{SW}}{\partial \Lambda} = a + T_1 \partial_1 \Lambda \frac{\partial a}{\partial \Lambda} \sim a \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial a} + T_1 \partial_1 \Lambda = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

which is again the homogeneity condition of Proposition 4.1, derived now from the Whitham dynamics of  $\Lambda$  (cf. (4.7)). If we multiply by  $1/2\pi i$  and integrate over  $B$  one gets further

$$\sigma_{11} = a^D + T_1 \frac{\partial \Lambda}{\partial T_1} \partial_\Lambda a^D = a^D + T_1 \partial_1 a^D \quad (4.17)$$

(note this could also be concluded from (4.7) as in (4.13)).

Now one goal here is to relate  $T_1$  and  $\Lambda$  in the sense that  $T_1 F_1^W = \Lambda F_\Lambda^W$ . Pragmatically this is what occurs as shown in [12] (cf. also Remark 2.3), based on [7, 24, 30, 50] (cf. also [52]) and one wants also to reconcile this with formulas like (2.20) for example. There is also another problem in determining what depends on what and we will comment on this in Remark 5.7. We have seen in (2.5) for example, or analogously in  $\eta^2 = (\lambda - v)(\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)$  that

many things can vary together. One sees that a priori  $d\tilde{\omega}$  and  $d\check{\Omega}_1$  depend only on  $(v, \Lambda)$  while  $dS_{SW} = (\lambda - v)d\lambda/\pi\sqrt{2}$  depends only on  $(\Lambda, v)$ . Hence  $a = \oint_A dS_{SW}$ ,  $a^D = \oint_B dS_{SW}$ , and  $\tau = \oint_B d\tilde{\omega}$  depend only on  $(\Lambda, v)$ . Now using  $\gamma$  and  $T \sim T_1$  as Whitham times produces a dependence of  $(\Lambda, v)$  on  $(\gamma, T)$  so  $\tau$  becomes a function of  $(\gamma, T)$  as do the coefficients  $\sigma_{1m}$  and  $q_{1m}$  in  $d\tilde{\omega}$  and  $d\check{\Omega}_1$ . The defining equations for  $a$  and perhaps  $a^D$  should then be considered as “constraints”. Note first that no constraint arises from

$$\gamma = T_1 a = \oint_A T_1 dS_{SW}(T, \gamma) = \oint_A d\tilde{S}(T, \gamma) = \gamma \oint_A d\tilde{\omega} = \gamma \quad (4.18)$$

which is tautological, while

$$\gamma^D = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint_B d\tilde{S}(T, \gamma) = \frac{\gamma}{2\pi i} \oint_B d\tilde{\omega} + \frac{T_1}{2\pi i} \oint_B d\check{\Omega}_1 = \frac{\gamma\tau}{2\pi i} + T_1\sigma_{11} \quad (4.19)$$

which simply defines  $\gamma^D$  as a function of  $(\gamma, T_1)$ . Evidently if  $\partial\gamma^D/\partial T_1 \neq 0$  one can determine  $T_1 = T_1(\gamma, \gamma^D)$  and we record

$$\partial_1 \gamma^D = \frac{\gamma\tau_1}{2\pi i} + \sigma_{11} + T_1 \partial_1 \sigma_{11} \quad (4.20)$$

(this is a reminder that it would be helpful to have explicit formulas for  $d\tilde{\omega}$ ,  $\tau$ , and  $d\check{\Omega}_1$ ). To see the constraint aspect simply look at the definition  $a = \oint_A dS_{SW}(v, \Lambda) = \oint_A dS_{SW}(a, T_1)$ . Explicitly one can look at (3.10) to see that

$$a = \sqrt{2}(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2} F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) \quad (4.21)$$

with  $(v, \Lambda) = (v, \Lambda)(\gamma, T_1) \sim (v, \Lambda)(a, T_1)$  so  $a$  is not unrestricted (cf. Remark 5.7 for a few related comments). Let us compute now from (4.21) to get

$$a_v = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \frac{\sqrt{v + \Lambda^2}}{v + \Lambda^2} F + \sqrt{2} \sqrt{v + \Lambda^2} F_4 \left[ \frac{-2\Lambda^2}{(v + \Lambda^2)^2} \right]; \quad (4.22)$$

$$a_\Lambda = \frac{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{v + \Lambda^2} 2\Lambda F}{2(v + \Lambda^2)} + \sqrt{2}\sqrt{v + \Lambda^2} F_4 \left[ \frac{4\Lambda}{v + \Lambda^2} - \frac{4\Lambda^3}{(v + \Lambda^2)^2} \right]$$

Thus

$$a_v = \frac{a}{2(v + \Lambda^2)} - \frac{2\sqrt{2}\Lambda^2 F_4}{(v + \Lambda^2)^{3/2}}; \quad a_\Lambda = \frac{\Lambda a}{v + \Lambda^2} + \frac{\sqrt{2}F_4 4v\Lambda}{(v + \Lambda^2)^{3/2}} \quad (4.23)$$

leading to

**PROPOSITION 4.2.** The calculations above yield

$$a_v - \frac{a}{2(v + \Lambda^2)} = -\frac{\Lambda}{2v} \left[ a_\Lambda - \frac{\Lambda a}{v + \Lambda^2} \right] \Rightarrow 2va_v + \Lambda a_\Lambda = a \quad (4.24)$$

This seems quite charming and we observe that it is also a simple consequence of  $a(t^2v, t\Lambda) = ta(v, \Lambda)$ . In particular can we relate this to (3.26) and (3.27). Thus

$$a_v = \tilde{\sigma} = -\frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{2}} \oint_A \frac{d\lambda}{\eta}; \quad a = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2}} \oint_A \frac{(\lambda - v)d\lambda}{\eta} \quad (4.25)$$

and we abandon here the formula (3.27) for  $a_\Lambda|_v$  since it seems incompatible with (4.26) below. Note from (4.23) the formula (to be used below)

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\sigma} - \frac{a}{2(v + \Lambda^2)} &= -\frac{2\sqrt{2}\Lambda^2 F_4}{(v + \Lambda^2)^{3/2}} \Rightarrow a_\Lambda = \frac{\Lambda a}{v + \Lambda^2} - \frac{2v}{\Lambda} \left( \tilde{\sigma} - \frac{a}{2(v + \Lambda^2)} \right) = \\ &= -\frac{2v\tilde{\sigma}}{\Lambda} + \frac{a}{v + \Lambda^2} \left( \Lambda + \frac{v}{\Lambda} \right) = -\frac{2v\tilde{\sigma}}{\Lambda} + \frac{a}{\Lambda} \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

**REMARK 4.3.** There seems to be some variety in notation concerning hypergeometric representations of  $a$  and  $a^D$ . Let us recall a few basic facts about hypergeometric functions (cf. [1]). Thus a standard notation is

$$\int_0^1 s^{b-1}(1-s)^{c-b-1}(1-zs)^{-a} ds = \frac{\Gamma(c-b)\Gamma(b)}{\Gamma(c)} F(a, b, c, z) \quad (4.27)$$

For  $a$  we will be dealing with  $b-1 = -1/2$ ,  $c-b-1 = -1/2$ , and  $a = -1/2$  (thus  $a = -1/2$ ,  $b = 1/2$ , and  $c = 1$ ) and we write (4.27) via  $z = 1/u$  and  $s = (\zeta + \Lambda^2)/2\Lambda^2$  as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{u^{1/2}} \int_{-\Lambda^2}^{\Lambda^2} (\zeta + \Lambda^2)^{-1/2} (\Lambda^2 - \zeta)^{-1/2} \left( u - \frac{\zeta + \Lambda^2}{2\Lambda^2} \right) d\zeta = \\ = \frac{\Gamma(1/2)\Gamma(1/2)}{\Gamma(1)} F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

Setting  $u - (1/2) = v/2\Lambda^2$  and recalling  $\Gamma(1/2) = \sqrt{\pi}$  with  $\Gamma(1) = 1$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \pi F &= \frac{1}{(2\Lambda^2 u)^{1/2}} \int_{-\Lambda^2}^{\Lambda^2} (\zeta + \Lambda^2)^{-1/2} (\zeta - \Lambda^2)^{-1/2} (\zeta - v)^{1/2} d\zeta = \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{v + \Lambda^2}} \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{2}} a(v, \Lambda) \Rightarrow a = \sqrt{2}(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2} F \end{aligned} \quad (4.29)$$

confirming (3.10) for  $a$  (cf. also [31, 48]).

**REMARK 4.4.** Let us also list here a few more formulas from [31, 48] of possible use. Thus in [31]  $\eta^2 = (\lambda - v)(\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)$  and  $\lambda_{SW} = (1/2\pi\sqrt{2})(\lambda - v)^{1/2}(\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)^{-1/2} d\lambda$ , which is  $(1/2)dS_{SW}$  in our sense, so we multiply the formulas of [31] by 2 or  $1/2$  when appropriate. Then

$$a_v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2v}} F\left(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4}, 1, \frac{\Lambda^4}{v^2}\right);$$

$$a_v^D = \frac{i}{\Lambda} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{\Lambda^2 - v}{2\Lambda^2}\right) \quad (4.30)$$

and for  $a_v^D$  there is also an analytic continuation formula given in [31] with argument  $v^2/\Lambda^4$ . Another formula mentioned in [31] is

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{e_1}^{e_2} \frac{dx}{[(x - e_1)(x - e_2)(x - e_3)]^{1/2}} = \\ & = \frac{1}{\sqrt{e_3 - e_1}} \int_0^1 \frac{dt}{[t(1 - t)(1 - ht)]^{1/2}} = \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{e_3 - e_1}} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, h\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

where  $h = (e_2 - e_1)/(e_3 - e_1)$ . Another quantity of interest is  $\hat{\tau} = a^D/a$  which has the same monodromy as  $\tau = F_{aa}^{SW}$  (cf. [7]). Evidently from  $a^D = F_a^{SW}$  one has also  $F_{aa}^{SW} = \tau = a_v^D/a_v$  (cf. [31] and note that in this section  $a^D = (1/2\pi i) \oint_B dS_{SW} = F_a$  so  $a^D/a = \tau/2\pi i$  as in (4.14)). Further formulas from [48] are (for  $y^2 = (x^2 - 1)(x - u)$  and  $\lambda_{SW} = (1/\pi\sqrt{2})(x - u)^{1/2}(x^2 - 1)^{-1/2}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \check{a} &= \sqrt{2}(u + 1)^{1/2} F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2}{u + 1}\right); \\ \check{a}^D &= \frac{i(u - 1)}{2} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 2, \frac{1 - u}{2}\right) = \frac{i(u - 1)}{\sqrt{2}(u + 1)^{1/2}} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, 2, \frac{u - 1}{u + 1}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

(one is interested in different regions of validity). Further

$$\check{a}_u = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}\pi} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2}{u + 1}\right); \quad \check{a}_u^D = \frac{i}{2} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{1 - u}{2}\right) \quad (4.33)$$

and we can also write

$$\check{a}_u = \frac{k}{\pi} K(k); \quad \check{a}_u^D = \frac{ik}{\pi} K'(k); \quad \check{a} = \frac{4}{\pi k} E(k); \quad \check{a}^D = \frac{4i}{\pi k} [K'(k) - E'(k)] \quad (4.34)$$

where  $k = [2/(u + 1)]^{1/2}$  and  $K, E$  are complete elliptic integrals of the first and second kind. The usual modular parameter  $\tau_0 = ik'/K$  becomes  $\check{a}_u^D/\check{a}_u$  which is the effective coupling  $\tau = (\theta/2\pi) + (4i\pi/g^2)$ . One checks easily now that (4.32) gives the correct value  $a = \sqrt{2}\sqrt{v + \Lambda^2} F(-1/2, 1/2, 1, 2\Lambda^2/(v + \Lambda^2))$  upon substitutions  $u = v/\Lambda^2$  and  $x = \lambda/\Lambda^2$ . For  $\check{a}_u$  we must consider

$$\begin{aligned} \check{a}_u &= \frac{\partial}{\partial u} \oint_A \frac{(x - u)^{1/2} dx}{\pi\sqrt{2}(x^2 - 1)^{1/2}} = -\frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{2}} \oint_A \frac{dx}{y} = \\ &= \frac{\Lambda}{\sqrt{2}(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.35)$$

Here from (4.25) we note that  $a_v = \tilde{\sigma} = -(1/2\pi\sqrt{2}) \oint_A (d\lambda/\eta)$  so

$$\check{a}_u = -\frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{2}} \oint_A \frac{dx}{y} = -\frac{\Lambda}{2\pi\sqrt{2}} \oint_A \frac{d\lambda}{(\lambda - v)^{1/2}(\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)^{1/2}} = \Lambda a_v \quad (4.36)$$

Hence we must have

$$a_v = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) = \tilde{\sigma} = -\frac{\tilde{c}}{2\pi\sqrt{2}} \quad (4.37)$$

(in agreement with the first formula of (4.30)) and leading to

$$\tilde{c} = -\frac{2\pi}{(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) \quad (4.38)$$

in which form one must note that for the  $A$  cycle  $-\Lambda^2 \leq \lambda \leq \Lambda^2 < v$  so

$$\tilde{c} = \oint_A \frac{d\lambda}{\eta} = -\oint_A \frac{d\lambda}{(v - \lambda)^{1/2}(\Lambda^4 - \lambda^2)^{1/2}} \quad (4.39)$$

and we note for  $v \geq \Lambda^2$  that  $2\lambda^2/(v + \Lambda^2) \leq 1$  so the argument of the hypergeometric function is reasonable.

Next we want explicit formulas for  $a_\Lambda$  and  $\tau$  so consider first (using (4.31) with  $e_1 = \Lambda^2$ ,  $e_3 = -\Lambda^2$ , and  $e_2 = v$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &= \oint_B d\tilde{\omega} = \frac{1}{\tilde{c}} \oint_B \frac{d\lambda}{\eta} \sim \frac{2}{\tilde{c}} \int_{\Lambda^2}^v \frac{d\lambda}{(\lambda - v)^{1/2}(\lambda^2 - \Lambda^2)^{1/2}} = \\ &= \frac{2\pi}{\tilde{c}(-2\Lambda^2)^{1/2}} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{v - \Lambda^2}{-2\Lambda^2}\right) = \frac{2\pi}{i\tilde{c}\sqrt{2}\Lambda} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{\Lambda^2 - v}{2\Lambda^2}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

This should be compared then to  $\tau = a_v^D/a_v$  or (via (4.30) and (4.37))

$$\tau = \frac{2\pi\sqrt{2}}{i\tilde{c}\Lambda} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{\Lambda^2 - v}{2\Lambda^2}\right) \quad (4.41)$$

Thus (4.40) and (4.41) agree if we multiply (4.40) by 2 (as indicated earlier for formulas of [31]). Explicitly now, using (4.38) we have

**PROPOSITION 4.5.** Under the hypotheses indicated

$$\tau = \frac{i\sqrt{2}(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}}{\Lambda} \frac{F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{\Lambda^2 - v}{2\Lambda^2}\right)}{F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right)} \quad (4.42)$$

The range of validity is  $|(\Lambda^2 - v)/2\Lambda^2| \leq 1$  and  $|2\Lambda^2/(v + \Lambda^2)| \leq 1$  which gives a common region  $\Lambda^2 \leq v \leq 3\Lambda^2$ . For other values one would need analytic continuation formulas for example which exist in abundance.

Next consider  $a_\Lambda$  and we'll try to make sense of (4.26). First (4.26) gives (cf. (4.24))

$$a_\Lambda = -\frac{2v}{\Lambda} a_v + \frac{a}{\Lambda} = -\frac{\sqrt{2}v}{\Lambda(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) +$$

$$+ \frac{\sqrt{2}(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}}{\Lambda} F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) \quad (4.43)$$

Then differentiate  $a$  in (4.21) directly to get ( $F = F(-1/2, 1/2, 1, 2\Lambda^2/(v + \Lambda^2))$ )

$$a_\Lambda = \sqrt{2}(v + \Lambda^2)^{-1/2} \Lambda F + \frac{4\sqrt{2}\Lambda v}{(v + \Lambda^2)^{3/2}} F_4 \quad (4.44)$$

Now for example (cf. [1])

$$\frac{d}{dz} F(a, b, c, z) = \frac{ab}{c} F(a+1, b+1, c+1, z) \quad (4.45)$$

which implies

$$a_\Lambda = \frac{\sqrt{2}\Lambda}{(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}} F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) - \frac{\sqrt{2}v\Lambda}{(v + \Lambda^2)^{3/2}} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 2, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) \quad (4.46)$$

We note now the relation (cf. [1])

$$cF(a, b, c, z) - cF(a+1, b, c, z) + bzF(a+1, b+1, c+1, z) = 0 \Rightarrow \quad (4.47)$$

$$\Rightarrow F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, z\right) - F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, z\right) + \frac{z}{2} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}, 2, z\right) = 0$$

(where  $z = 2\Lambda^2/(v + \Lambda^2)$ ). Using this in (4.46) gives

$$\begin{aligned} a_\Lambda &= \frac{\sqrt{2}\Lambda}{(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}} F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) - \frac{\sqrt{2}v}{\Lambda(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}} \times \\ &\times \left[ F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) - F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4.48)$$

Hence

$$a_\Lambda = -\frac{v\sqrt{2}}{\Lambda(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}} F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) + \frac{\sqrt{2}(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}}{\Lambda} F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2}\right) \quad (4.49)$$

which agrees with (4.43).

We consider also now the dependence of the coefficients  $\sigma_{11}$  and  $q_{11}$  on  $(\Lambda, v)$  via  $d\tilde{\omega} = -\sum_{1}^{\infty} \sigma_{1m} z^{m-1} dz$  where  $z \sim \lambda^{-1/2}$  and  $d\tilde{\Omega}_1 = (-cz^{-2} - \sum_{1}^{\infty} q_{1m} z^{m-1}) dz$ . Here  $d\tilde{\Omega}_1 = (1/\pi\sqrt{2}) d\tilde{\Omega}_1 = (1/\pi\sqrt{2})(\lambda - \tilde{\alpha}) d\lambda/\eta$  and  $\tilde{a} = (\tilde{c}/\pi\sqrt{2})(\tilde{\alpha} - v)$  (cf. **(EE)**). Thus for small  $z \sim \lambda^{-1/2}$  one obtains (via  $(1+x)^{-1/2} = 1 - (x/2) + (3x^2/8) + \dots$ )

$$\frac{d\lambda}{\eta} = \frac{d\lambda}{[(\lambda - v)(\lambda^2 - \Lambda^4)]^{1/2}} = -2dz \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2}vz^2 + \dots \right] \quad (4.50)$$

Hence  $(\mathbf{Q})$   $\sigma_{11} = 2/\tilde{c}$ . Further we also have

$$d\check{\Omega}_1 = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2}}(z^{-2} - \tilde{\alpha})(-2 - vz^2 - \dots)dz = \frac{dz}{\pi\sqrt{2}}[-2z^{-2} + (2\tilde{\alpha} - v) + O(z)] \quad (4.51)$$

This gives the multiplier  $c = \sqrt{2}/\pi$  of (4.3) and exhibits  $(\mathbf{R})$   $q_{11} = (v - 2\tilde{\alpha})/\pi\sqrt{2} = -(v/\pi\sqrt{2}) - (2\tilde{\alpha}/\tilde{c}) = -(v/\pi\sqrt{2}) - \tilde{a}\sigma_{11}$ . Summarizing gives

**PROPOSITION 4.6.** Under the hypotheses indicated  $q_{11} = -(v/\pi\sqrt{2}) - \tilde{a}\sigma_{11}$  with

$$\sigma_{11} = -\frac{(v + \Lambda^2)^{1/2}}{\pi F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v+\Lambda^2}\right)}; \quad q_{11} = -\frac{v}{\pi\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\sqrt{2}(v + \Lambda^2)}{\pi} \frac{F\left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v+\Lambda^2}\right)}{F\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{2\Lambda^2}{v+\Lambda^2}\right)} \quad (4.52)$$

Finally, note that a formula for  $\partial_\Lambda u$  arises in (2.17) for  $\delta a = 0$  so in the present context we can write for  $a$  fixed  $a_v|_\Lambda \delta v + a_\Lambda|_v \delta \Lambda = 0$  where  $a_v|_\Lambda = \tilde{\sigma}$  is given in (4.37) and  $a_\Lambda|_v$  is given by (4.26) or (4.43)  $\equiv$  (4.49). From (4.26) we get in particular (recall  $T_1 \partial_1 v = -(a/\tilde{\sigma})$  from (4.8))  $a_\Lambda = -(2v\tilde{\sigma}/\Lambda) + (a/\Lambda) = -(2v/\Lambda)a_v + (a/\Lambda)$  which implies

**PROPOSITION 4.7.** Under the hypotheses indicated

$$\tilde{\sigma} \frac{\partial v}{\partial \Lambda} + \frac{a}{\Lambda} - \frac{2v\tilde{\sigma}}{\Lambda} = 0 \Rightarrow \Lambda v_\Lambda = 2v - \frac{a}{\tilde{\sigma}} = 2v + T_1 \partial_1 v \quad (4.53)$$

which corresponds exactly to (2.20).

## 5 $T_1$ AND $\Lambda$ DERIVATIVES OF $F$

We go now to  $F^W$  as (4.5) for example and will try to determine explicitly the  $T_1$  and  $\Lambda$  derivatives in order to see how it is reasonable to write  $T_1 \partial_1 F^W = \Lambda \partial_\Lambda F^W$ . We doubt that  $T_1 \partial_1 F^W$  and  $\Lambda \partial_\Lambda F^{SW}$  can be compared (cf. Remark 2.3) so what must be clarified is how to deal with the  $T_1$  and  $\Lambda$  dependence of quantities in  $F^W$  and how to express the sense in which  $\Lambda \sim T_1$ . Thus  $2F^W = (1/2\pi i)T_1^2 a^2 \tau + 2T_1^2 a \sigma_{11} + T_1^2 q_{11}$  and a priori  $a$ ,  $\tau$ ,  $\sigma_{11}$ , and  $q_{11}$  all depend on  $T_1$  through Whitham dynamics. Thus from (4.11) and Proposition 4.1 one has  $T_1 \partial_1 v + a \partial_a v = 0$  with  $T_1 \partial_1 \Lambda + a \partial_a \Lambda = 0$ . Here the relation  $\partial_a = T_1 \partial_\gamma$  has been used which is appropriate since we deal with  $\partial_\gamma$  for  $T_1 = c$  and  $\partial_1$  for  $\gamma = c$ . Consider now  $\sigma_{11} = 2/\tilde{c} = -1/\pi\sqrt{2}\tilde{\sigma}$  and  $q_{11} = -(v/\pi\sqrt{2}) - a\sigma_{11} = -(v/\pi\sqrt{2}) + (a/\pi\sqrt{2}\tilde{\sigma})$  so one has

$$\begin{aligned} 2F^W &= \frac{T_1^2}{2\pi i} a^2 \tau + 2T_1^2 a \sigma_{11} + T_1^2 \left( -\frac{v}{\pi\sqrt{2}} - a\sigma_{11} \right) = \\ &= -\frac{T_1^2 v}{\pi\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\gamma^2 \tau}{2\pi i} - \frac{T_1 \gamma}{\pi\sqrt{2}\tilde{\sigma}} \end{aligned} \quad (5.1)$$

We can assume  $\gamma$  and  $T_1$  are independent to obtain

$$\partial_1 F^W = -\frac{2T_1 v}{\pi\sqrt{2}} - \frac{T_1^2 \partial_1 v}{\pi\sqrt{2}} + \frac{\gamma^2 \partial_1 \tau}{2\pi i} - \frac{\gamma}{\pi\sqrt{2}\tilde{\sigma}} - \frac{T_1 \gamma}{\pi\sqrt{2}} \partial_1 \tilde{\sigma}^{-1} \quad (5.2)$$

On the other hand  $F^W(T_1 = 1) \sim F^{SW}$  with  $\gamma \rightarrow a$  and e.g.

$$\partial_\Lambda F^{SW} \Big|_v = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \partial_\Lambda (a^2 \tau) \Big|_v - \partial_\Lambda \left( \frac{a}{\pi \sqrt{2} \tilde{\sigma}} \right) \Big|_v \quad (5.3)$$

For the  $\partial_1$  derivatives in (5.2) one can in principle assume  $\gamma$  fixed with  $(v, \Lambda)$  functions of  $T_1$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 F^W = & -\frac{\sqrt{2} T_1 v}{\pi} - \frac{T_1^2 \partial_1 v}{\pi \sqrt{2}} - \frac{\gamma}{\pi \sqrt{2} \tilde{\sigma}} + \\ & + \frac{\gamma^2}{2\pi i} [\tau_v|_\Lambda v_1 + \tau_\Lambda|_v \Lambda_1] - \frac{T_1 \gamma}{\pi \sqrt{2}} [\partial_v \tilde{\sigma}^{-1}|_\Lambda v_1 + \partial_\Lambda \tilde{\sigma}^{-1}|_v \Lambda_1] \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

We have at our disposal now explicit formulas for the  $v$  and  $\Lambda$  derivatives as well as relations such as  $4(\Lambda^4 - v^2)\tilde{\sigma}_v = a$ ,  $T_1 v_1 = -a/\tilde{\sigma}$ , etc. First consider  $\partial_\Lambda F^{SW}$  from (5.3) in the form ( $v$  constant)

$$\partial_\Lambda F^{SW} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} [2a a_\Lambda \tau + a^2 \tau_\Lambda] - \frac{1}{\pi \sqrt{2}} \left( \frac{a_\Lambda}{\tilde{\sigma}} - \frac{a \tilde{\sigma}_\Lambda}{\tilde{\sigma}^2} \right) \quad (5.5)$$

From **(T)** we have now  $\Lambda a_\Lambda = a - 2v\tilde{\sigma}$  while  $\Lambda \tau_\Lambda = \beta(\tau)$  from (3.3). For  $\tilde{\sigma} = -\tilde{c}/2\pi\sqrt{2}$  we consider (cf. (4.38))

$$\tilde{c}_\Lambda = -\frac{\Lambda \tilde{c}}{v + \Lambda^2} = \frac{4\pi \Lambda v F_4}{(v + \Lambda^2)^{5/2}} \quad (5.6)$$

This  $F_4$  is not the same as that arising in (4.21) - (4.22) but since we know  $\tilde{\sigma}_v$  we can eliminate  $F_4$  via  $\tilde{c}_v$ . Thus

$$\tilde{c}_v = -\frac{\tilde{c}}{2(v + \Lambda^2)} + \frac{4\pi \Lambda^2 F_4}{(v + \Lambda^2)^{5/2}} \quad (5.7)$$

This implies (after some calculation)

$$\tilde{c}_\Lambda = -\frac{v}{\Lambda} \tilde{c}_v - \frac{\tilde{c}}{2\Lambda} \left[ 1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2} \right] \quad (5.8)$$

**PROPOSITION 5.1.** We can write (5.8) in two ways. First directly

$$\Lambda \tilde{c}_\Lambda + v \tilde{c}_v = -\frac{\tilde{c}}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2} \right] \quad (5.9)$$

and second, using  $\tilde{c} = -2\pi\sqrt{2}\tilde{\sigma}$  and  $4(\Lambda^4 - v^2)\tilde{\sigma}_v = a$  one has

$$\Lambda \tilde{c}_\Lambda + \frac{\tilde{c}}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2} \right] = -v \tilde{c}_v = \frac{\pi v a}{\sqrt{2}(\Lambda^4 - v^2)} \quad (5.10)$$

This now gives us all the ingredients needed for (5.5). Thus, writing  $\tilde{\sigma}_\Lambda = -\tilde{c}_\Lambda/2\pi\sqrt{2}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda\partial_\Lambda F^{SW} &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left[ 2a\tau(a - 2v\tilde{\sigma}) + a^2\beta(\tau) \right] - \\ &- \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2}} \left\{ \frac{a - 2v\tilde{\sigma}}{\tilde{\sigma}} + \frac{a}{2\pi\sqrt{2}\tilde{\sigma}^2} \left[ \frac{\pi va}{\sqrt{2}(\Lambda^4 - v^2)} + \pi\sqrt{2}\tilde{\sigma} \left( 1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2} \right) \right] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

which is of possible interest due to the presence of the beta function. Consequently we state

**PROPOSITION 5.2.** From (5.11) follows

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda\partial_\Lambda F^{SW} &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left[ 2a^2\tau - 4va\tilde{\sigma}\tau + a^2\beta(\tau) \right] - \\ &- \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{2}} \left[ \frac{a}{\tilde{\sigma}} - 2v + \frac{va^2}{4\tilde{\sigma}^2(\Lambda^4 - v^2)} + \frac{a}{\tilde{\sigma}} \left( 1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{v + \Lambda^2} \right) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

Now we want to check the vague formula  $(\mathbf{U}) \quad \Lambda\partial_\Lambda F = -(2iu/\pi) = 2F - aF_a|_\Lambda$  which is supposed to agree somehow with  $T_1\partial_1 F$  (cf. [7, 8, 12, 13, 24, 27, 30, 42, 46, 50, 52]). It is not clear here à priori how this role  $T_1 \sim \Lambda$  arises or what the exact statement should be. In particular  $(\mathbf{U})$  is presumably valid for  $F = F^{SW}$  but  $\partial_1 F$  is defined only for  $F = F^W$ . Moreover  $F^{SW} \sim F^W(T_1 \rightarrow 1)$  so it is not clear how  $\Lambda \sim T_1$  can be managed. First let us clarify some matters of homogeneity. The argument is made in [7, 50] that since  $\tau = F_{aa}$  is dimensionless one has  $aF_a|_\Lambda + \Lambda F_\Lambda|_a = 2F$  (where  $F \sim F^{SW}$ ). In dealing with  $F^{SW} \sim F$  as a function of  $(a, \Lambda)$  we are using  $F = F(v, \Lambda)$  with  $a = a(v, \Lambda)$ . Then if  $a_v \neq 0$  one solves for  $v = v(a, \Lambda)$  and puts this in  $F = F(v, \Lambda) \sim F(a, \Lambda)$ . Recall also  $a_v \sim \tilde{\sigma}$  so generically this should be satisfactory. As noted after Proposition 4.2,  $a(t^2v, t\Lambda) = ta(v, \Lambda)$ , leading to  $2va_v + \Lambda a_\Lambda = a$  and similarly one checks that  $\tilde{\sigma}(t^2v, t\Lambda) = (1/t)\tilde{\sigma}(v, \Lambda)$  which implies  $2v\tilde{\sigma}_v + \Lambda\tilde{\sigma}_\Lambda = -\tilde{\sigma}$ . Since  $\tilde{\sigma} = a_v = -(1/2\pi\sqrt{2})\oint_A(d\lambda/\eta)$  and  $\tau\tilde{\sigma} = -(1/2\pi i)(1/2\pi\sqrt{2})\oint_B(d\lambda/\eta)$  (cf. (4.14)) we have also  $2v(\tau\tilde{\sigma})_v + \Lambda(\tau\tilde{\sigma})_\Lambda = -\tau\tilde{\sigma}$ . Consequently

**PROPOSITION 5.3.** From the formulas indicated follows the homogeneity  $2v\tau_v + \Lambda\tau_\Lambda = 0$  and from  $a(t^2v, t\Lambda) = ta(v, \Lambda)$  one gets  $\tau(ta, t\Lambda) \sim \tau(t^2v, t\Lambda) = \tau(v, \Lambda) \sim \tau(a, \Lambda)$  which means  $a\tau_a + \Lambda\tau_\Lambda = 0$  (the dimensionless property).

One sees also that homogeneity properties can be determined from the hypergeometric representations directly. For example in (4.42), setting  $\Lambda = t\Lambda_0$  and  $v = t^2v_0$  the argument in the hypergeometric functions is unchanged as in the multiplier in front. Hence  $\tau(t^2v, t\Lambda) = \tau(v, \Lambda)$ . Further from (4.52)  $\sigma_{11}(t^2v, t\Lambda) = t\sigma_{11}(v, \Lambda)$  so  $(\mathbf{V}) \quad 2v\partial_v\sigma_{11} + \Lambda\partial_\Lambda\sigma_{11} = \sigma_{11}$  while  $q_{11} = -(v/\pi\sqrt{2}) - a\sigma_{11}$  satisfies  $q_{11}(t^2v, t\Lambda) = t^2q_{11}(v, \Lambda)$  (which is also obvious from (4.52)) leading to  $(\mathbf{W}) \quad 2v\partial_vq_{11} + \Lambda\partial_\Lambdaq_{11} = 2q_{11}$ . As a result one can look at  $2F^W = T_1^2[(a\tau/2\pi i) + 2a\sigma_{11} + q_{11}]$  to see that  $F^W(t^2v, t\Lambda) = t^2F^W(v, \Lambda)$  yielding

**PROPOSITION 5.4.** For fixed  $T_1$  the prepotential  $F^W$  satisfies  $2v\partial_vF^W + \Lambda\partial_\LambdaF^W = 2F^W$ .

Further since  $(v, \Lambda) \rightarrow v(a, \Lambda)$  with  $a(t^2v, t\Lambda) = ta(v, \Lambda)$  we can write for  $T_1$  fixed  $F^W(v, \Lambda) = F^W(a, \Lambda)$  (in an obvious abuse of notation). It follows that  $F^W(ta, t\Lambda) \sim F^W(t^2v, t\Lambda) = t^2F^W(v, \Lambda) \sim t^2F^W(a, \Lambda)$ . Consequently

**COROLLARY 5.5.** For fixed  $T_1$ ,  $F^W$  satisfies  $aF_a^W + \Lambda F_\Lambda^W = 2F^W$ .

One notes that if  $F(a, \Lambda)$  is homogeneous of degree two then  $F_{aa}$  is homogeneous of degree zero. The converse would produce  $F$  of degree 2 from  $\tau \sim F_{aa}$  of degree 0 and for suitable  $F$  this follows from  $(1/t)f(ta) = \int_0^a f_{a'}(ta')da' = \int_0^a f_{a'}(a')da' = f(a)$ . Now the general Whitham theory produces  $T_1F_1^W + \gamma F_\gamma^W = 2F^W$  (cf. [10, 30, 46]) and for  $T_1$  fixed with  $\gamma = T_1a$ ,  $F_a = T_1F_\gamma$  yielding  $(\Phi)$   $T_1F_1^W + aF_a^W = 2F^W$ ; consequently

**PROPOSITION 5.6.** The identification  $T_1F_1^W \sim \Lambda F_\Lambda^W$  follows from  $(\Phi)$  and Corollary 5.5.

**REMARK 5.7.** There are still various questions of what depends on what and we consider a few aspects of this here. From Proposition 4.1 we know  $T_1\partial_1v|_{\Lambda, \gamma} + a\partial_av|_{\Lambda, 1} = 0$  and  $T_1\partial_1\Lambda|_{\gamma, v} + a\partial_a\Lambda|_{1, v} = 0$  while from (4.21) for example one has a “constraint”  $a = a(v, \Lambda)$  and  $(v, \Lambda) = (v, \Lambda)(\gamma, T_1) \sim (v, \Lambda)(a, T_1)$ . Now first, for say  $v(\gamma, T_1)$ , one can write  $\delta v = v_\gamma|_1\delta\gamma + v_1|_\gamma\delta T_1$  and for  $T_1 = c$ ,  $v_\gamma = (1/T_1)v_a$  with  $\delta\gamma = T_1\delta a$  so  $\delta v = v_a|_1\delta a + v_1|_\gamma\delta T_1$ . Similarly  $\delta\Lambda = \Lambda_a|_1\delta a + \Lambda_1|_\gamma\delta T_1$  and the Jacobian of the map  $(a, T_1) \rightarrow (v, \Lambda)$  apparently is, by homogeneity,  $\Delta = v_1\Lambda_a - v_a\Lambda_1 = 0$ , which seems curious. Indeed it is wrong since the homogeneity relations explicitly require  $\Lambda$  or  $v$  fixed so in fact  $(\Delta)$   $\Delta = v_1|_\gamma\Lambda_a|_1 - v_a|_1\Lambda_1|_\gamma$  and  $v_a|_1$  for example refers to  $\partial_av(a, T_1)|_1$  which is a priori quite different from  $v_a|_{1, \Lambda}$  in the homogeneity condition. Secondly, from  $\gamma = T_1a(v, \Lambda) = k$  there results

$$a + T_1a_v|_{\Lambda, \gamma}v_1|_{\Lambda, \gamma} + T_1a_\Lambda|_{\gamma, v}\Lambda_1|_{\gamma, v} = 0 \quad (5.13)$$

This relation was very productive when either  $\Lambda$  or  $v$  is held constant, as indicated in (4.8) and (4.16). We note that  $v_a|_{1, \Lambda}$  is not the same as  $v_a|_{\gamma, \Lambda}$  so the homogeneity conditions only produce a formula  $(Y)$   $a_v|_{\gamma, \Lambda}v_a|_{1, \Lambda} + a_\Lambda|_{\gamma, v}\Lambda_a|_{1, v} = 1$ , of no apparent use.

## References

- [1] H. Bateman, Higher transcendental functions, Vol. 1, McGraw Hill, 1953
- [2] A. Bellisai, F. Fucito, M. Matone, and G. Travaglini, hep-th 9706099
- [3] E. Belokolos, A. Bobenko, V. Enolskij, A. Its, and V. Matveev, Algebro-geometric approach to nonlinear integrable equations, Springer, 1994
- [4] G. Bertoldi and M. Matone, hep-th 9712039 and 9712109
- [5] A. Bilal, Quantum fields and quantum space time, Plenum, 1997, pp. 21-43
- [6] A. Bloch and Y. Kodama, SIAM Jour. Appl. Math., 52 (1992), 909-928

- [7] G. Bonelli and M. Matone, Phys. Rev. Lett., 76 (1996), 4107-4110; Phys. Rev. Lett., 77 (1996), 4712-4715
- [8] G. Bonelli and M. Matone, hep-th 9712025
- [9] G. Bonelli, M. Matone, and M. Tonin, Phys. Rev. D, 55 (1997), 6466-6470
- [10] R. Carroll and J. Chang, solv-int 9612010, Applicable Anal., 64 (1997), 343-378
- [11] R. Carroll, solv-int 9606005, Proc. Second World Congress Nonlin. Analysts, Athens, 1996, Nonlin. Anal., 30 (1997), 187-198
- [12] R. Carroll, hep-th 9712110
- [13] R. Carroll, hep-th 9802130
- [14] R. Carroll and Y. Kodama, Jour. Phys. A, 28 (1995), 6373-6378
- [15] R. Carroll, Nucl. Phys. B, 502 (1997), 561-593; Lect. Notes Phys. 502, Springer, 1998, pp. 33-56
- [16] R. Carroll, Remarks on WDVV, In preparation
- [17] J.H. Chang, Thesis, Univ. Illinois, In preparation
- [18] C. Clemens, A scrapbook of complex curve theory, Plenum, 1980
- [19] E. D'Hoker, I. Krichever, and D. Phong, hep-th 9610156, Nucl. Phys. B, 494 (1997), 89-104; hep-th 9609041 and 9609145
- [20] E. D'Hoker and D. Phong, hep-th 9701055 and 9709053
- [21] R. Donagi, alg-geom 9705010
- [22] R. Donagi and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B, 460 (1996), 299-334
- [23] B. Dubrovin, Lect. Notes Math., Springer, 1996, pp. 120-348; Nucl. Phys. B, 379 (1992), 627-689; Comm. Math. Phys., 145 (1992), 195-207; Integrable systems, Birkhäuser, 1993, pp. 313-359
- [24] T. Eguchi and S. Yang, Mod. Phys. Lett. A, 11 (1996), 131-138
- [25] H. Flaschka, M. Forest, and D. McLaughlin, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 33 (1980), 739-784
- [26] A. Gorsky, I. Krichever, A. Marshakov, A. Mironov, and A. Morozov, Phys. Lett. B, 355 (1995), 466-474
- [27] A. Gorsky, A. Marshakov, A. Mironov, and A. Morozov, hep-th 9802007

- [28] A. Gorsky, S. Gukov, and A. Mironov, hep-th 9707120 and 9710239
- [29] K. Ito and S. Yang, hep-th 9712018 and 9803126; Phys. Lett. B, 366 (1996), 165-173 and 415 (1997), 45-53
- [30] H. Itoyama and A. Morozov, hep-th 9511126, 9512161, and 9601168; Nucl. Phys. B, 477 (1996), 855-877 and 491 (1997), 529-573
- [31] H. Kanno and Y. Ohta, hep-th 9801036
- [32] A. Klemm, hep-th 9705131
- [33] A. Klemm, W. Lerche, and S. Theisen, hep-th 9505150, Inter. Jour. Mod. Phys. A, 11 (1996), 1929-1973
- [34] I. Krichever and D. Phong, hep-th 9604191, Jour. Diff. Geom, 45 (1997), 349-389
- [35] I. Krichever, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., 47 (1994), 437-475; Acta Applicandae Math., 39 (1995), 93-125; Comm. Math. Phys., 143 (1992), 415-429
- [36] I. Krichever and D. Phong, hep-th 9708170
- [37] W. Lerche, hep-th 9611190
- [38] A. Losev, N. Nekrasov, and S. Shatashvili, hep-th 9711108
- [39] M. Mariño and G. Moore, hep-th 9712062 and 9802185
- [40] A. Marshakov, A. Mironov, and A. Morozov, hep-th 9607109 and 9710123; Mod. Phys. Lett. A, 12 (1997), 773-787
- [41] E. Martinec and N. Warner, Nucl. Phys. B, 459 (1996), 97-112
- [42] M. Matone, Phys. Lett. B, 357 (1995), 342-348; Phys. Rev. D, 53 (1996), 7354-7358; Phys. Rev. Lett., 78 (1997), 1412-1415
- [43] A. Mironov, hep-th 9709205
- [44] A. Mironov and A. Morozov, hep-th 9712177
- [45] A. Morozov, hep-th 9711194
- [46] T. Nakatsu and K. Takasaki, Mod. Phys. Lett. A, 11 (1996), 157-168
- [47] S. Novikov, S. Manakov, L. Pitaevskij, and V. Zakharov, Theory of solitons, Plenum, 1984
- [48] S. Ryang, Phys. Lett. B, 365 (1996), 113-118
- [49] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B, 426 (1994), 19-52; 431 (1994), 484-550

- [50] J. Sonnenschein, S. Theisen, and S. Yankielowicz, Phys. Lett. B, 367 (1996), 145-150
- [51] W. Springer, Introduction to Riemann surfaces, Chelsea, 1981
- [52] K. Takasaki, hep-th 9803217